Columbia University
Contributions to Education
Teachers College Series

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 15 1946
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LA328
.B62

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM: NEW HAMPSHIRE

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 15 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

EUGENE ALFRED BISHOP, PH.D.

TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION, NO. 391

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
Teachers College, Columbia University
NEW YORK CITY
1930

Copyright, 1930, by Teachers College, Columbia University

Printed in the United States of America by
J. J. LITTLE AND IVES COMPANY, NEW YORK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I could desire no more than that the value of this study might equal the sincerity of my gratitude to those who have shown me kindness during its preparation. I am especially grateful to Dr. George D. Strayer and Dr. Edward H. Reisner of Teachers College, Columbia University, who, in an advisory capacity, have shown only the most sympathetic spirit of constructive criticism and encouragement. Their efforts to be genuinely inspiriting have been equaled only by those to be honestly critical. I also wish to express my appreciation of the kindness and coöperation of State Commissioner of Education Ernest W. Butterfield of New Hampshire. To Dean Albert N. French of the University of New Hampshire I would express my heartfelt thanks for personal and official favors which have made my efforts possible. And of my colleagues, Dr. Herbert F. Rudd, Professor Norman Alexander, and Mr. John Redden, I shall cherish always happy memories as keen participants in many helpful discussions of the problems of the work.

To state the part which my wife has had in bringing this little study to its consummation would be as if I should here declare the extent of my own participation in the task.

E. A. B.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION . . . 1
- Plan of the Study . . . 2

II. THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN SOCIAL CONTROL . . . 5

III. THE BACKGROUND OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S SCHOOL PROBLEM . . . 10

IV. COLONIAL PERIOD: THE OLD NEW HAMPSHIRE TOWN SCHOOLS . . . 17

V. THE PERIOD OF DISTRICT DOMINATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOLS . . . 33

VI. RISE OF THE SUPERVISORY UNION AND INCREASE OF STATE INFLUENCE . . . 73

VII. FINAL STEPS TOWARD A STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NEW HAMPSHIRE . . . 95
- I. Conditions Culminating in the School Law of 1919 . . . 95
- II. Provisions of the School Law of 1919 and Resultant Administrative Organization . . . 102

VIII. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT UNDER THE SCHOOL LAW OF 1919 . . . 111
- 1. Equalizing and Extending the School Year . . . 114
- 2. School Attendance . . . 117
- 3. Schoolhouses . . . 118
- 4. Health and Sanitation . . . 120
- 5. Teachers . . . 122
- 6. Supervision . . . 128
- 7. Secondary Education . . . 134
- 8. Americanization and Illiteracy . . . 136
- 9. Cost . . . 139

IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . 146

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . 158

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM: NEW HAMPSHIRE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Evidence would seem to show that no state in the Union has, at the present time, a higher degree of centralization of authority and power in the organization, administration, and support of the public schools than has New Hampshire. In no state does the law, in general, give greater power to a state-wide authority to initiate, direct, and decide the educational policy and practice which is to affect each of the small local communities. And it might also be said that there is no better example of the effects upon educational attainment of different degrees of centralization and decentralization of authority in the organization and administration of the common public schools than that which is to be found in the educational history of the state of New Hampshire.

That New Hampshire should be a state which has developed a relatively highly centralized system of schools might well surprise anyone who has some acquaintance with the origin and the development of the history and the tradition of that state. For nowhere in all New England was the tradition and the practice of decentralization of authority, the insistence upon and faith in the efficacy and fundamental correctness of "local self-government" more universal, more persistent, and more deeply rooted than it has been from the beginning in New Hampshire.

The first traces of the nearly three hundred years of educational effort in the state are to be found in the early colonial schools which each small local settlement established through its own initiative, supported entirely from local resources, and organized and administered according to purely local methods and standards. From this beginning, and through and out of nearly three hundred years of varying degrees of insistence upon the right of "local self-government" has evolved the present relatively highly centralized system of public schools in the state. In view of this fact, it is possible that a study of the development of the New Hampshire system of public education might throw some light upon the problems of organization and administration of public schools. In the various phases of that development, from the earliest conditions of decentralization and local direction to the present condition of relatively marked centralization and state control, may be observed and studied the practical results of different theories and methods of administration and support.

Such a study is attempted in these pages. It is not presented as an exhaustive historical treatise. Such would require volumes, as even a superficial survey of the available data will attest. It is hoped, however, that the presentation may show correctly the development of the system of school organization, administration, and support, with emphasis upon the causes and results of varying degrees of centralization and decentralization of power and authority in control. The study may properly be said to revolve around the problem of discovering what influences and forces have operated, and with what results, in causing this evolution of a relatively highly centralized state public school system in New Hampshire.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The sources of the data which serve as foundation for the study may be generally specified under four separate heads:

I. *The Laws of New Hampshire.*
More than two hundred and seventy-five different enactments of New Hampshire legislative bodies concerning public education and public schools have been examined and analyzed.
II. *Annual Reports* of the State Commissioner of Education, Secretary of the State Board of Education, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1852 to 1926.
III. Reports of local town and district school officers.
IV. Miscellaneous histories, town chronicles, and papers.

Perhaps the most consecutive and official account of the desires, purposes, and ideals of the people of a democratic state regarding organization, administration, and support of their public schools is to be found in the laws which they have enacted through their representatives. There one finds stated succinctly the popular will regarding the establishment, organization, and financing of these institutions. The law designates and commands the creation of what is considered to be the most desirable administrative machinery, and specifies the proper province and scope of its powers. It states the intent and represents the beliefs of the makers as to what should come to pass, and what conditions should obtain in any particular regard. These laws do not, of course, necessarily represent what was actually accomplished. For information regarding what was really done by the people under these statutes, the data given in the headings II, III, and IV, on page 2, may be consulted. In the state reports of the educational department, in the reports of the local school committees, and in the town history and other histories of the people and communities of the state of New Hampshire, may be found the account of their educational accomplishment. Here one may read of inability to apply the theories of the lawmakers, of local shiftlessness in meeting the legal demands, and of commendable zeal which carried the accomplishments of some communities beyond the most extreme hopes of those who had commanded through the law. And in the rising tide of complaint and criticism of some prevailing condition, coming from those who were engaged year after year in the work of the schools, and who wrote these reports, one may see the coming of waves of opposition which were sooner or later to cast the broken fragments of the old and unfruitful law into the driftwood of repeal.

The organization and presentation of the data concerning the administrative control and growth of the public schools of New Hampshire are preceded in this study by

I. A short discussion of the theory of centralization and decentralization in social control, especially education, and

II. A brief explanation of the New Hampshire setting for the problem of the study—a summarizing description of the history, climate, industrial development, and other factors which have determined the thought and social policies of the people of the state.

Against this background are presented materials intended to show the outstanding steps and sequences in the development of the New Hampshire state public school system. It is desired to give a comprehensive view of the whole, to reveal each phase in its proper relationship with the others and the whole, and to depict the large causal movements and sequences which brought particular conditions into being. At the same time it is planned to depict the development, sequences, and results of the chief types of administrative organization which have marked various stages in the evolution. Consideration is given to the employment of the District, the Town, the Supervisory Union and the State as the unit of support, administration, and control of public school education, and the effects of these various types of organization and administration upon such factors as maintenance and support, course of study, supervision, instructional staff, amount of schooling, material educational facilities, and so forth.

And having first summarized the conditions existing in 1919 as an outgrowth of all preceding methods in organization and administration, the concluding chapters present the features of the "state equalization and control" legislation of 1919, and its amendments, and the results which have been secured by the application of its provisions in an attempt to solve the problems of public school education in the state of New Hampshire.

The purpose of every part of the study is to present some aspect or phase in the development from a beginning of purely local organization, administration, and support of the public school to the present relatively highly centralized system wherein the State is an influential factor in maintenance and control. It is hoped to discover what have been the causes and the effects upon educational attainment of the various administrative policies which have marked the steps in the evolution.

CHAPTER II

THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN SOCIAL CONTROL

Whether one be a student of Education, interested in the theoretical basis of public school systems, or the active educational administrator, attempting to formulate policies and create workable techniques, he will find that an insistent analysis of his problem will lead back to an ancient and basic controversy which seems always to be present where human beings are attempting to provide social remedy for the ills which beset them. This controversy concerns itself with the question of where the power to determine the policies which are to guide and shape the action of the group shall reside, and then to originate and apply techniques which will make these social decisions operative. The educational statesman seems, in the final analysis, not to face problems of administrative policy which differ materially in principle from those which confront administrators in all other lines of social endeavor.

No matter how greatly various social organizations may seem outwardly to differ, the fundamental principle and purpose is always the same. In the light of values which any particular group professes, there are things that should be done and things that should not be done, and someone must choose between them. In the light of chosen and desired ends, there are effective and ineffective ways of doing things, and someone must decide how they are to be done. Organization in human affairs has as its purpose the securing of these decisions as to what is to be done in the contingencies of group living, and how to do it.

This being the purpose of every phase of social organization, a chief and fundamental problem is always that of deciding how many and which of the group members are to decide social policies and create and apply administrative techniques. A first consideration might lead one to believe that this problem had been solved by different peoples in myriad fundamentally different ways.

Analyzed and classified from the standpoint of certain basic principles, however, forms of organization for the conducting of human affairs seem to vary greatly in only one fundamental respect; namely, the degree to which the power of decision of policy and its administration is centralized or decentralized.

What is meant by centralization and decentralization of power in social control?

The proper answer to this question involves consideration of the fact that there may be difference in opinion as to what constitutes a genuine decision-making group, or unit. Belief here may go to one extreme, which maintains that each individual human is the proper unit and should be left to absolute and private decision regarding the course of his personal action and choice of means for its consummation. Or, it may vary to the other extreme, that which maintains that any action of any human being is properly the concern of the people of the entire world, and that this world group is properly the unit which should decide policies of action for its entire membership and choose technical means for the realization of those choices. Between these two extremes lies room for almost any decision as to what are the limits and characteristics of the best unit or group to decide and administer human activity of any kind.

Difficulty in making this decision increases, of course, as the society concerned increases in size and complexity. It may be said that the society has increased in size in the degree to which the number (and perhaps geographical dispersement) of people having the same problem to solve has increased, and that it has increased in complexity in the degree to which the members of the society find themselves faced with an increasing number of problems in which they share concern with any or all of their fellow group members. It is probably defensible to say that as the activities and chosen values of any human being increase in number, he will find it necessary to make himself a member of an ever-increasing number of organized groups, thus availing himself of the assistance of those who favor the policies in which he believes, and of the institutional machinery and administrative techniques which may be created to effectuate these policies.

It is conceivable, then, that some of the values which one might wish to achieve and maintain would be gained best through the decision and action of some very small, restricted, and local group, while other values might be realized best through action of a very large and dispersed unit of control. A study of the history of social life seems to show that, as the society increases in size and complexity, the wants and needs of its members are best gained by a hierarchy of social organization, ascending and expending from restricted and local groups, which deal with those local wants and needs which one shares only with his very immediate associates, to the large and widespread social units which direct activities and interests which are shared by greater numbers over greater areas.

The problem of centralization and decentralization of power in social control has, then, as one of its phases, the question of whether the smaller and more local group shall decide what are the proper ends to be achieved in any field of its activity, and what procedures shall be used to realize them, or whether some larger, more remote, and apparently less concerned unit of control, of which the smaller group is perhaps only a fractional part, shall decide and administer.

Having decided what is the proper unit of control in any particular social activity, there comes another phase of the problem. It is the question of whether all the members of the group shall participate in deciding policies and methods, or whether some limited number of the group shall decide and act alone in matters which are the concern of the whole group. The extreme of centralization in this regard is reached in absolute tyranny where one lone member has it in his power to make every decision regarding any and every action of any member or number of members of the group. Theoretically, the extreme of decentralization would be reached in absolute anarchy where each individual member made every possible decision regarding his action, with no outward repression or compulsion. In governmental practice extreme decentralization is probably represented by pure democracy, where every group member personally helps in making every decision regarding policy, and personally assists in creating administrative means to apply that decision to group action. Between these extremes are all degrees of shading.

Based on the conceptions of democracy are all those forms of organization in which the principle is maintained that all power to decide and administer in matters of social concern rests ultimately and finally in the hands of all the members of the group, but in which, in practice, there is delegated to particular members, or groups of members of the whole unit, through whole group decision, power to make certain decisions for the group and to create and employ various techniques of control and social direction. This is known by the general name of "delegated authority," and part of the battle over the degree of centralization and decentralization of power in social control in the last century has raged about the question of what kinds of power, and in what degrees, should be voluntarily surrendered by the whole group into the hands of chosen individuals and sub-groups. On the other hand, there has been much conflict and controversy in attempting to decide just what powers, already in the hands of small, self-governing sub-groups of the whole, should be surrendered into the hands of the larger unit of control.

Through the history of every institution may be traced the influence of these two tendencies in deciding social policies and practice. The institutions which society has evolved for the education of its citizenry are in no sense exceptions. Two questions have always confronted any society as it set itself to the task of organizing, administering, and supporting its educational system:

1. What should be done by and through and for the public institutions for education?
2. What are the best ways of doing it?

In all attempts to give proper answer to these questions the society concerned has always been forced to decide what was the proper source to give best answer. Should a large and extended group—a state or the nation—decide what all the schools within its borders should do, and how to do it, or should each little school community decide policy, and provide all techniques for converting this policy into practice? Moreover, should all members of the group have equal power in deciding what is the proper work of the school, and what are the best procedures and techniques to employ in carrying on that chosen work, or should certain selected members of the group, supposedly knowing more of proper educational needs and effective educational techniques, decide and administer the educational activities of the group?

The history of education shows that almost every possible answer has been made to this question of proper source of decision in the matter of educational policy and procedure. There has been everything from absolute tyranny—complete centralization—to rather unlimited anarchy, in which each individual decided his own educational destiny. Decision has been made by large units of control on the one hand, and by local communities on the other. And with what results?

The history of the development of New Hampshire's public school system does not completely give answer to this question. It can hardly be said that the extreme of centralized authority or decentralized authority has ever been reached in the history of its schools. But it may fairly be said that for all practical purposes one may find, as he studies the evolution and growth of this state school system, all the effects, strengths, and weaknesses of various degrees of centralization and decentralization of authority in the organization, administration, and methods of support of a society's public institutions for the education of its citizenry.

CHAPTER III

THE BACKGROUND OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S SCHOOL PROBLEM

A prerequisite to an understanding of the development of the public school system of New Hampshire is some knowledge of the social, industrial, and political characteristics which have given background and direction to this educational evolution. It is not possible for one to interpret and appreciate the sequences in types of organization, administration, and support without knowing the conditions out of which those sequences grew. In view of the facts in the general social evolution of the state, it is possible to see that the development of the school system was but a phase of the great general movement and took its particular characteristics from the large pattern of which it was a part.

New Hampshire, one of the original thirteen states, has a land area of 9,031 square miles. This is but one three-hundredth part of the area of the whole nation. It is bounded on the north by the Province of Quebec, on the east by the state of Maine and the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by Massachusetts, and on the west by the state of Vermont, the Connecticut River being the boundary line between Vermont and New Hampshire. The general shape of the state is that of a triangle with its base, of about a hundred miles, resting on Massachusetts, and its length of about one hundred eighty-five miles.

The state has a sea coast of but eighteen miles. For twenty or thirty miles from the sea the country is somewhat level, or variegated by hills and valleys. Then comes a region of secondary mountains, and farther back and extending practically the entire length of the state, is a mountainous ridge of which the White Mountains are the most important. The northern section of the state is very mountainous. The tract of which Mt. Washington is the highest point has a territory of fourteen hundred square miles, and is sometimes called the Switzerland of America. The general altitude of the state is about a thousand feet above sea level. In the central part are many large lakes and ponds, Lake Winnepesaukee, with an area of seventy square miles, being the most important. New Hampshire is so situated that five of the largest rivers in New England take their rise within its limits, or receive much of their waters from its mountains, and the land of the region is in general traversed by numerous brooks and streams, and overgrown with trees and bushes.

The winters are long and snowy, the summers so cool as to attract large numbers of summer visitors. For the most part it may be said that the land of the state is rough and stony. Some conception of its value for agriculture may be gained from the fact that in 1920[1] the government estimated the New Hampshire farm land value at $18.21 per acre as compared with an average value for the whole nation of $57.36 per acre. Only two states of the entire union—Wyoming and New Mexico—had a lower value.

This region of hills and streams and rocks and small fertile valleys was granted by the Crown to Gorges and Mason, and in 1623 the first permanent settlements were made. It must be pointed out that these settlers were not exactly of the type of those who established the Massachusetts settlements. These New Hampshire colonists, imbued though they were with a strong spirit of insistence upon religious liberty and enlarged civil freedom, came to the new world primarily in search of wealth. They established Dover and Portsmouth and began "to cultivate the vine, to fish, and to trade." Settlements at Exeter, Hampton, and other points followed. Separated as these settlements were by distance and wilderness, each set up a local government and conducted its own affairs. Emphasis must be placed upon this fact. It was the New England "town system" of government, and was destined to have far-reaching influence in the state's educational development.

This "town system" of government was local in a sense that no other type of government in America, or elsewhere, has been. Each "town" was an irregular tract of land, usually about twenty to forty square miles in area, its boundaries set by a ridge of hills or by streams or other natural barrier. Somewhere, usually near the center, was the village with the Common, the meeting house, the school, and the town hall. All the citizens lived close around these community buildings, and the affairs of the settlement were regulated by decree of the town meeting which all legal citizens attended. All problems of taxation, education, and regulation of social behavior were grist for this mill, and the opinion and vote of every citizen contributed to a solution of all problems. The chief executive officers of the town always have been the selectmen. They were, and are, elected by vote of the citizens in town meeting assembled, were the managers of all the prudential affairs of the town, and had all legal powers necessary to the conducting of the town's corporate business. In general, it may be said that the town government in New Hampshire was, and still is, the almost exclusive instrument of local government, for never has the county been, as in the South and West, an active or well-recognized unit of social control. The next step above the town in New Hampshire government is the state. There is no genuine intermediate political structure.

---

[1] Abstract of the *Fourteenth Census*, 1920, p. 605.

It was under such conditions that the New England tradition of "local self-government" was created. These new communities of settlers found themselves cut off from established and organized sources of government and social welfare, and were face to face with the necessity of erecting and operating such local machinery of law and order as their situation demanded, and their means and wisdom made possible. Life as lived in these early New Hampshire towns was largely a local matter. Travel between communities was infrequent and communication difficult. The problems which any citizen faced were, for the most part, those of his immediate locality alone, and the affairs of any community were practically never the concern of anyone living outside of that community. The almost inevitable result was the growth of a feeling that regulation of the affairs and business of the community was properly, and almost inalienably, a problem for purely local consideration and decision. Through action of the local town meeting and the locally chosen board of selectmen the citizenry decided all social policies and developed some kind of administrative techniques.

These scattered settlements were harassed by the Indians, and massacre after massacre took place. Here was a problem of more than town-wide interest. The result was the creation of a wider administrative authority. In 1641 the four New Hampshire towns joined with the Massachusetts settlements under a common government. This union lasted for thirty-eight years, brought the

New Hampshire settlements under the influence of the Puritan educational conceptions, and gave common direction to the educational systems of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The later experience of New Hampshire as a royal province was not especially unlike that of all the other colonies, and she joined in the Revolution and assisted in the establishment of the nation at its close.

There should be noted here a phase in the development of the settlements which was to have very important bearing upon the educational fortunes of the state in later periods. Toward the close of the seventeenth century the Indians had been beaten off and the population had increased to the point where new settlements began to be made within the towns. Danger of attack being lessened, some of these settlements were made at long distances from the meeting houses and schoolhouses. The severity of the winters, the distances, the forests and the streams made attendance upon town meetings, church and school almost impossible, and each of these small settlements tended to become isolated and independent in its affairs. This condition later gave rise to the district system of school organization as a substitute for the town system.

There can be no genuine understanding of the trends and influences in the development of New Hampshire's educational problems without a consideration of the industrial evolution and population movements which have marked the nineteenth century. This can be best introduced by a presentation of population statistics. The table on page 14 gives the state's population figures for the ten-year periods since 1790.[2]

It may be seen that in the period immediately following the Revolution, New Hampshire experienced a "boom" in population. The little state gained almost 30 per cent in the ten-year period following 1790, and in the next two decades there was likewise a marked gain. Settlements were multiplied and new lands cleared and tilled. For the most part this increase in population was in the rural districts, and the chief occupation of the people was farming. In 1820, when the population was 244,161, the occupations of 62,141 people were reported.[3] More than five-sixths of these (52,384) were in agriculture, not quite one-seventh (8,699)

[2] Abstract of the *Fourteenth Census,* 1920, p. 18.

[3] Sanborn, Frank B., *New Hampshire.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1904.

in manufactures, and about one-sixtieth (1,058) of the reported population were engaged in commerce.

Then came two great movements—the development and settlement of the Great West, and the Industrial Revolution.

The effect of the settlement of the west may be noted first in the fact that since 1830 there has been but a slow increase in the population of New Hampshire. Its young men joined the move for fortune, adventure, and rich lands in the frontier country.

POPULATION CONDITIONS FOR THE TEN-YEAR PERIODS SINCE 1790

YEAR	POPULATION	PER CENT INCREASE FOR TEN YEARS
1790	141,885	
1800	183,858	29.6
1810	214,460	16.6
1820	244,161	13.8
1830	269,328	10.3
1840	284,574	5.7
1850	317,976	11.7
1860	326,073	2.5
1870	318,300	— 2.4
1880	346,991	9.0
1890	376,530	8.5
1900	411,588	9.3
1910	430,572	4.6
1920	443,083	2.9

The movement went on until the Civil War, and in the decade 1860-1870 there was an actual loss in New Hampshire's population of 2.4 per cent. The rich farms of the west poured their products into the markets in competition with the hard won fruits of New Hampshire's soil and the movement from the farms of New Hampshire increased.

About 1820 the Industrial Revolution began to influence the state. New Hampshire turned from farming to manufacturing. Her people began to move from the stony farms to the cities and villages where the mills gave opportunity for labor and industrial leadership. The call came in very insistent fashion to the capable young men on the farms. The rural region began to lose its potential leaders. Farms were abandoned. The story is told in the fact that in 1850 the government reported the number of farms in

New Hampshire as being 29,229 and in 1920 as 20,523.[4] The improved acreage fell from 2,251,488 acres in 1850 to 702,902 acres in 1920.[5] Nearly one and one-half million acres had gone back to pasture and woodland and wilderness. And whereas, in 1820, over 80 per cent of all occupations were reported as agricultural, in 1860 there was an almost equal number in manufacturing (46,533) and agriculture (46,573), and in 1920 of 309,858 persons gainfully employed, only 77,304, or 24.9 per cent were reported as in agricultural pursuits, while 120,248, or 38.7 per cent of the whole were engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries.[6] In 1920 the urban population of the state was 63.1 per cent of the whole.[7]

Added statistics would but emphasize the story. It is that of abandoned farms, ever-diminishing rural population, removal of strong young minds who would have become the local community leaders, and the depopulation, stagnation, and deterioration of hundreds of once vigorous rural communities. Its effect upon the fortunes of New Hampshire's public schools, their organization, administration, and support may be seen in every phase of the development from 1790 to the present time. Indeed, this movement has made *the school problem* of the state.

To counterbalance this emigration of the old New England stock, there has come an influx of immigrants in the last half century. In 1870, in a population of 318,300, the foreign born were but 29,611 or 9.3 per cent; in 1920 the foreign born were 20.6 per cent of the whole,[8] and the native born of native parentage were barely 51 per cent of the state's population. The French-Canadian stock makes 41.9 per cent of the total foreign born,[9] the Irish have 8.7 per cent, and the Greeks and Polish are in noticeable numbers.

This ethnic change has brought New Hampshire new problems of mixed cultures, parochial schools, illiteracy, and child labor. It may be seen as a specially important factor in recent school developments, and, in the garb of the problem of Americanization, generated the movement which resulted in the school law of 1919.

All these population shifts have created cities at the cost of rural population. Manchester, the largest city, has 78,384, of which

[4] Abstract of the *Fourteenth Census*, 1920, p. 610.

[5] *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 610.

[6] *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 500.

[7] *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 75.

[8] *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 100.

[9] *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 311.

35.1 per cent are foreign born.[10] There are six cities in New Hampshire having ten to twenty-five thousand people,[11] and 24.1 per cent of the state's people live in cities of more than twenty-five thousand.[12] In 1890 the percentage was 11.7.

In general it may be said that the total income of the governmental agencies of New Hampshire is not greater than some larger and more prosperous states spend for education alone. Add to this the fact that this wealth is largely concentrated in the villages and cities, and it may be seen that the problem of financial support of education becomes a complex and difficult one.

The state government, under the state constitution, has the usual legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It should be noted, however, that the Governor's Council of five, elected by popular vote, has appreciable powers in directing and checking his action. The legislature, it may be added, has the largest body of lawmakers in any American state, the House of Representatives having now four hundred and three members. The insistence of each small community upon its right to have a representative does much to create this unwieldly legislative body, and speaks eloquently of the New England tradition of the right of each local community to be heard in the councils of government.

The salient facts, then, in the development of New Hampshire are: It is a small state, with broken and mountainous soil; it has a deep-rooted tradition of "local self-government" through the "town"; it had a rapid population growth in the early part of the nineteenth century, followed by emigration and development of industry which changed it from an almost purely agricultural state to an industrial region; and, finally, an influx of immigrants has gone far to change the character of its slowly increasing population. The concentration of wealth and people left numerous localities with small financial resources and isolated families, and these depleted regions of the state threatened to bring forth an ignorant and socially unproductive generation, largely unblessed by the heritage of their race's accumulated knowledge. Surely this is background for a romance in educational engineering.

---

[10] Abstract of the *Fourteenth Census,* 1920, p. 115.

[11] *Ibid.,* 1920, p. 60.

[12] *Ibid.,* 1920, p. 77.

CHAPTER IV

COLONIAL PERIOD: THE OLD NEW HAMPSHIRE TOWN SCHOOLS

The early records of New Hampshire education are scant and incomplete. It is not until the birth of the American nation in the closing years of the eighteenth century that one begins to find more complete and consecutive accounts and records of legal enactments and social policy regarding educational matters.

As has been pointed out in a preceding chapter, each early settlement in New Hampshire was largely independent, and was left to a local solution and realization of the belief that education should be promoted by every community. One finds in the early records of the colony no systematic plan, and nothing of what we would now designate as a public school system. It is not, of course, to be thought that nothing was being done for the teaching of the children of the settlers. This was a people with a tradition of common learning, and one searches the records in vain for account of a single community which ever permitted a generation to grow to completely illiterate adulthood. In the absence of organized schools parents resorted to teaching in the home. A characteristic result of this home training is shown by an instance noted in a short history of education in the town of Rindge.

> William Russell, an infant when his parents removed to Rindge, was twenty years of age when the first public schools were instituted; yet he was among the earliest of grammer-school teachers. Many instances of this character, too numerous and apparent to escape observation, might be cited.[1]

As early as 1658 there was a school in Dover in which the master was requested to teach "to reid, write, caste a compte, latine, as the parents shall require."[2] Any educational effort at this time, however, "must have been sustained by private enterprise, as New Hampshire, on account of internal troubles, was divided into four distinct governments (although the whole population in 1641 did not exceed a thousand) and was too weak to give protection to the people, much less could they provide for the support of schools." [3]

---

[1] *New Hampshire State School Report*, 1876, p. 271.

[2] *New Hampshire Province Papers*, Vol. 1, p. 312.

However, as has been noted heretofore, the four New Hampshire towns united with a larger number of towns to their south to form the colony of Massachusetts in 1641. One year later, in 1642, the united thought of these intrepid colonists was turned to the problem of the perpetuation of the social inheritance of knowledge, and the first New England law on education was enacted.

ACT OF 1642

Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoof and benefit to any commonwealth, and whereas many parents and masters are too indulgent, and negligent of their duty in that kind,

It is ordered, that the selectmen of every town in the several precincts and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilant eye over their neighbors, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in their families, as not to endeavor to teach, by themselves or others, their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them to read perfectly the English tongue, and to get knowledge of the capital laws, upon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect therein.

Also, that all masters of families do, once a week at least, catechise their children and servants in the grounds and principles of religion.[4]

Study of this old primary educational statute reveals no provision for public schools. It does, however, insist upon universal education, since it required the parents and masters to provide instruction for the children dependent upon them.

There exist practically no records to show the degree of enforcement and effect of the law. It is important to us rather as showing the attitude of the early settlers in New Hampshire toward learning. It certainly represents a very high degree of decentralization and local power, the colony of Massachusetts, as the larger unit, insisting only that the town selectmen provide for a minimum course of study—the English tongue and religious teaching—leaving means and methods entirely to local and private endeavor.

In 1647 a most signal event in the history of colonial education took place. The Great and General Court of Massachusetts, of which Colony the New Hampshire settlements were then a part, passed what is known as the Act of 1647.

---

[3] Bush, George G., *History of Education in New Hampshire*. United States Bureau of Education, 1898, p. 9.

[4] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 42.

ACT OF 1647

It being one chiefe project of that ould deluder, Sathan, to keepe men from the knowledge of the Scripture as in former times, by keeping them in an unknowne tongue, so in these latter times, by perswading from the use of tongues, so that at least, the true sence, and meaning of the original might be clouded by false glosses of saint-seeming deceivers, that learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers in the church and comon-wealth the Lord assisting our endeavors:

It is therefore ordered by this courte and authority thereof, That every towneshipp within this jurisdiction, after that the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty howsholders, shall then forthwith appointe one within theire towne to teach all such children who shall resort to him, to write and read; whose wages shall be paid either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in generall, by way of supplye, as the major part of those who order the prudentials of the towne shall appointe; provided, that those who send theire children, bee not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other townes; and it is further ordered, that where any towne shall increase to the number of one hundred families or howsholders, they shall sett up a grammar schoole, the masters thereof being able to instruct youths so far as they may bee fitted for the university; and if any towne neglect the performance hereof above one yeare, then every such towne shall pay five pounds per annum to the next such schoole, till they shall perform this order.[5]

By this act public schools were established in New Hampshire as an obligation. The whole colony undertook to compel the maintenance of these by the separate towns, and under conditions imposed by the larger unit of control. It is to be noted, however, that this law did not provide for compulsory *Free* public schools, since the cost was to be upon the patrons of the school except in those cases in which the town, by majority vote, voluntarily chose to assume it. It is very important to note that the Act did rather clearly express the principle that private property might be subjected to public taxation for the support of public schools to which all children could "resort" to be taught to read and write. Moreover, the intent of the law is to provide schooling for *all* children. It has been maintained that "even in the most progressive towns of the state the public schools have now been opened to girls for barely a century."[6] There may well be some doubt of the correctness of this statement, since the records of the town of Hampton read:

---

[5] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 42.

[6] *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 43.

> On the 2 of the 2 mo: 1649:
>
> The selectmen of this Towne of Hampton have agreed with John Legat for this present yeare insueing—To teach and instruct all the children of or belonging to our Towne, both mayle and femaile (w^{ch} are capiable of learning) to write and read and cast accountes (if it be desired) as dilegently and as carefully as he is able to teach and instruct them; And so dilegently to follow the said imployment att all such time and times this yeare insueing, as the wether shall be fitting for the youth to com together to one place to be instructed: And allso to teach and instruct them once a week, or more, in some Arthodox chatechise provided for them by their parents or masters.
>
> And in consideration hereof we have agreed to pay or cause to be payd unto the said John Legat the som of twenty pounds, in corne and cattle and butter att price currant, as payments are made of such goods in this Towne, and this to be payd by us quarterly, paying 5 pounds every quarter of the yeare after he has begun to keep school.[7]

This would seem to prove the fallacy of the statement, so far as relates to Hampton, at least, "That for more than one hundred and fifty years girls were excluded from the privileges of the schools in New England."

Through the Act of 1647 the whole colony insisted that under certain conditions the local towns must also provide education on a secondary level, since the "grammar schoole" for which the law provides was designed to prepare "youths so far as they may be fitted for the university." Thus the larger unit of control took upon itself the right to decide what degree of schooling should be provided, no matter what the local desires might be in the matter. "This was the law, but in effect free high school tuition did not extend to all the children of the state until the last years of the nineteenth century." [8]

Although the law was compulsory in that it left the towns no choice as to whether a school should be maintained, it did not in any way make it compulsory for children to attend school, or obligate parents or masters to send them to school. It plainly states the principle of "educational opportunity," but not of "educational necessity." "It was the beginning of our state school system, but there is little evidence that for one hundred fifty years it was generally enforced." [9]

---

[7] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1876, p. 180.

[8] *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 43.

[9] *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 43.

One cannot, however, feel that there was a real desire to neglect the education of its children in a town which would, as did Portsmouth, contribute funds to the erection of a building at the new College at Cambridge in 1669. After speaking of the embarrassment of the college and the need of perpetuating "knowledge, both religious and civil, among us and our posterity after us" they continue:

> The premises considered, we have made a collection in our town of sixty pounds per annum (and hope to make it more), which said sum is to be paid annually for these seven years ensuing, to be improved at the discretion of the honored overseers of the college for the behalf of the same, and the advancement of good literature there; hoping withal that the example of ourselves (which have been accounted no people) will provoke the rest of the country to jealousy.[10]

That this interest in education was not local is shown by the fact that Dover added thirty-two pounds and Exeter ten pounds to this fund for Harvard College.

In 1667 another law was passed by the General Court of the colony of Massachusetts which required each town in the jurisdiction to appoint a schoolmaster, and also to erect a schoolhouse. There is to be found little evidence that this law was enforced, but it represents a growing tendency on the part of the central authority to dictate educational policy and conditions to the smaller local governmental units, the towns.

In 1680 the New Hampshire towns were separated once more from the Massachusetts Colony, and the first session of the New Hampshire colonial legislature was held in Portsmouth. The education laws of Massachusetts were copied upon the New Hampshire statute books and became the law of the New Hampshire province. We may suppose that there had been some tendency for towns or teachers to dishonor their contracts of service, for the first new educational enactment of the New Hampshire legislature was a law of 1686 reading in part:

> It is also Ordered, That all Contracts, Agreements, and Orders regularly made in any Town respecting either their Ministers or Schoolmasters as to their Maintenance . . . shall remain good and valid for the whole time that they were made for, and shall accordingly be Pursued, put in Execution, and Fulfilled.[11]

---

[10] Bush, George G., *History of Education in New Hampshire*, p. 10.

[11] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period*, Vol. I, Chap. 14, 1686.

In 1692, "An act Concerning the prudential affaires of the townes in Saide province" was passed, a provision of which was that,

> Packers of porke beefe & Mackrill Sealers of Leather cullors of Staves to take care they be provided with a Schoole master not vistious in Conversation. . . .[12]

On August 5, 1693, the New Hampshire provincial legislature passed the first important school law, other than those brought from the union with Massachusetts, in the history of the state. It was "An Act for maintenance & Suppley of the Ministrey (and Schools) within this Province—," and read in part:

> . . . for the building & repayring of meeting houses, Ministers houses School houses, And allowing a Sallary to a School Master in Each Towne within this Province the selectmen, in the respective Townes, Shall raise money by an Equal rate, an Assesm't upon the Inhabitants, . . . And Every Towne within this Province, (Dover onely Excepted Dureing the warr) shall from and after the Publication, here of provide a School, Master for the Supply of the Towne, On Penalty of Ten pounds per Annom for neglect there of: To be paid one halfe to their Maj'ties the other halfe to the poore of the towne.[13]

On May 10, 1708, the New Hampshire lawmakers first put the word "free" into the school laws of the state in a title "An Act for a free school to bee kept at Portsmouth."

> Whereas there is noe Latin School yett Established in any Town in this Province, for the Encouragement of Learning and Vertue.
>
> Bee itt therefore Enacted by his Excellency the Governour Councill and Representatives convend in Generall Assembly, and by ye authority of ye Same, that a Latin school bee kept att Portsm° in ye said province . . .
>
> that the Schoolmaster from time to time bee appointed by his Excellency, Councill and Settled ministers of the town . . .
>
> and that the said Schoolmaster bee payd by ye Severall Towns within this Province the Sum of fifty pounds money, per annum, besides what ye Selectmen of Portsm° shall order to be pd by Each of there Inhabitants that Send their children to learn latin . . .
>
> and to bee a free School for writers, Readers and Latinists & the several sums to bee pd by Each Town are as follows viz^t Portsm° twenty Eight pounds, Hampton Eight pounds, Dover six pounds, Exeter six pounds, and Newcastle two pounds, and that this act continue too years and that the Select men in Every Town within ye Province make

---

[12] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. I, Chap. 2, 1692.

[13] *Ibid.,* Vol. I, Chap. 2, 1693.

> Assessm^t on there Inhabitants for Each of there proportions, as aforesaid, to bee Collected and payd unto the said Schoolmaster Yearly by ye first day of March.[14]

The act then empowers justices and sheriffs to levy on the estates of any selectmen who fail to make the assessments, and recover in amount of the deficient taxes, the sums so collected to be paid "to the school master from year to year."

This free school must have been quite successful for we find the legislature on May 16, 1710, resolve that,

> . . . whereas wee are Sensible of the Great Benefitt to all her Majesties good Subjects in the Education of their Children by the late Act for the Establishm^t of a Grammar ffree school in the Town of portsmouth by an Act of the General Assembly which is now Expired.
>
> Be it therefore enacted . . . that a Latin School be Kept at ports° In the said province.[15]

The Act of 1708 had provided for "a free School for writers, Readers and Latinists," but the new law provided that it should be free "Excepting soe much thereof as shall be Raised upon the Latin Schollars at twenty shillings per head."

The Law of 1693 was reënacted in 1714,[16] and Dover, which had been permitted to maintain no school "Dureing the warr," [17] was included with the other towns. Then on May 18, 1716, the legislature took the very first step in a program of legislation—that of increasing the number of local schools and schoolhouses—which was to be one of the most determining factors in New Hampshire educational development, both for good and for ill. In this first act it was

> Voted That where any Parish is sett off from any town to maintain a minister by themselves, they shall have pow^r wthin themselves to agree wth a publick schoolmaster & to build or hire a School house, as they shall think convenient.[18]

Thus was begun that long period of decentralization in control and support, of dependence upon local maintenance and insistence on local management which was later to result in a vast number

[14] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. II, Chap. 5, Laws of 1708.

[15] *Ibid.,* Vol. II, Chap. 1, Laws of 1710.

[16] *Ibid.,* Chap. 22, Laws of 1714.

[17] King William's War.

[18] *Journal of the Council and Assembly,* 3 Province Papers, 646.

of small, locally supported, mismanaged and tradition ridden "deestrict schools," which period was brought to a more or less complete end only through the action of a New Hampshire law-making body more than two hundred years later.

The Law of 1647 was copied almost exactly in a school act of the legislature of 1719,[19] the only modification being an increase of the penalty from five pounds to twenty pounds. A provision was also included that if any town "suppose themselves uncapable of Complying wth this act they shall apply themselves to ye Gen Quarter sessions who are hereby Impowered to Determine ye same."

It would seem that the intent of the lawmakers was better than the performance of the towns, for the preamble of the education act of 1721 sets forth that,

> Whereas the selectmen of Sundry Towns within this Province often Neglect to provide Grammar Schools for their Respective Towns whereby their Youths Loose much of their Time, to the great Hindrance of their learning, For Remedy whereof
>
> Be it enacted . . . that so offten as it happens that any Such Town or Parish as aforesaid (after Publication hereof) is Destitute of a Grammar School for the space of one month, the Selectmen of such Town or Parish shall forfeit to be paid out of their own Estates the Sum of Twenty pounds for Every Such Neglect, & to be applyed towards the Defraying the Charges of the Province.[20]

This law of 1721 added compulsion to the permission granted under the law of May 18, 1716, for Parishes to maintain schools separate from the town, and stipulated "that Not only Each Town but each parish within this Province Consisting of one hundred Families shall be Constantly Provided with a Grammar School."

All of these laws had, of course, been passed by legislatures made up of residents of the Province, although they had been approved by the Royal Governor. There is little evidence to show what attitude the royal government took toward education in the colony. In the "Instructions in Commission of William Burnet as Governor of New Hampshire," issued by the Crown, it is commanded that he "enter upon proper Methods in the Erecting & maintaining of Schools in Order to the training up of Youth to Reading and to a necessary Knowledge of ye principles of Religion." [21]

---

[19] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. II, Chap. 9, Laws of 1719.

[20] *Ibid.,* Vol. II, Chap. 3, Laws of 1721.

Exactly the same instructions were issued in the Royal Commission to Jonathan Belcher as Governor in 1730, and to Benning Wentworth as Royal Governor in 1741. There seems to be no evidence to show whether this was merely an attitude of nominal encouragement and support of education in the Province upon the part of the Crown, or whether there was a genuine insistence that the cause of learning be given governmental support. Certain it is that for a full half-century from the legislation of 1721 nothing went into the law of New Hampshire regarding education or its maintenance, and the period of British rule in America was brought to a close by the American Revolution with no added education law except for a single act in 1771 [22] which reduced from twenty pounds to ten pounds the penalty upon officers who failed to maintain a public school, since the sum was "originally set in Paper bills of Credit, no ways Adequate to the Nominal Sum in Lawful money."

When one attempts to evaluate the educational efforts and accomplishments of this Colonial period in comparison with those of our own times, it becomes apparent that there was lacking much that is now considered absolutely necessary in an educational program. In this early period, there was an almost complete absence of professional requirements and supervision. The selectmen of the town, or the people in town meeting, passed upon the qualifications of any proposed teacher. It was stipulated in the commission of the royal governors that,

> We do further direct that no Schoolmaster be henceforth permitted to come from England and to keep School in the said Province, without the License of the said Bishop of London; and that no other Person now there, or that shall come from other parts, shall be admitted to keep School in that Our said Province of New Hampshire, without your License first obtained.

In spite of this order, however, it appears that the qualification of the teachers was passed upon almost exclusively by the local groups. The records of the town of Hampton tell that at a town meeting, 19: 9 mo: 1674, a vote was taken on the question whether the town will receive R........ J........ of Andover as a schoolmaster, and it was decided in the negative.[23]

---

[21] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. II, p. 434.

[22] *Ibid.,* Vol. III, Chap. 6, Laws of 1771.

> The usual way of employing a teacher was for the town to authorize and direct the selectmen, or a special committee chosen for the occasion, to attend to the business, leaving them to act according to their own judgment, but sometimes giving them particular instructions. In some cases the town determined by a direct vote whether a particular person should be employed.[24]

It is to be noted that the act which established the "free school to bee kept at Portsmouth" provided that,

> the schoolmaster from time to time bee appointed by his Excellency, Councill and Settled ministers of the town . . . [25]

but a perusal of the old town records assures one that, except in some few special cases, as this at Portsmouth, the business of employing and passing upon the qualifications of teachers all during this period was a matter almost entirely in the hands of the town meetings, their chosen selectmen, or specially appointed committees of citizens.

In the matter of schoolhouses there was such uniformity of practice as mere chance and existing conditions might bring. The fact that the schools of the period were moved about in the towns from one locality to another made it necessary that they avail themselves of such housing facilities as they could temporarily command. The old town records are filled with accounts of votes wherein these temporary schools were established. Typical is that recorded in Hampton, March 20, 1759, it being voted "to have a school for reading and writing for six months, besides the standing school, to be removed so as shall best accommodate the people," [26] and on March 18, 1766, it was "Voted, that the school shall be removed to such parts of the town as shall be equally beneficial to the whole town—to be determined by the selectmen." [27] The subordinate place that schools held to the church and religious activity is shown, also, by a vote in the town meeting of Hampton on May 17, 1692, when it was decided to build "within the fort, at the town's expense, a house 14 by 16 feet for the use of the minister, and when not occupied by him, it was to be used for a schoolhouse." [28]

---

[23] *New Hampshire School Report,* 1876, p. 183.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. II, Chap. 5, 1708.
[26] *New Hampshire School Report,* 1876, p. 186.
[27] *Ibid.,* 1876, p. 186.

Another typical vote was that in the town of Swanzey on December 9, 1773, when it was "Voted that a school shall be kept this year part of the time at Mr. David Belding's house, and part of the time at the house which was Doct. Nathaniel Hammond's," [29] and in 1727 the town of Londonderry voted "the Public school shall be kept at the meeting house five months from date (May), the other six months in the out parts of the town where convenient." [30] This constant moving of the schools made it unprofitable to erect permanent schoolhouses, and it was not unusual to find a town providing for the housing of their schools as did Hampton in a town meeting on the thirtieth of November, 1801, when it was voted, "That the North District shall have Jonathan Sanborn's Barn for a Schoolhouse." [31]

These old town records bear witness, also, to the fact that there was no settled policy in the towns in the matter of maintaining schools. In the town of Londonderry [32] in 1720, "some wanted a school, but a majority voted 'there is no school to be kept in town this winter.'" In 1725 it was "voted there shall be a school in each quarter of the town, if persons suitable can be found for keeping the same . . . ," and the very next year it was "Voted there shall be but one school kept in town." In 1729 it was "Voted to leave the management of the schools with the selectmen," and in 1732 two public schools were voted, "beaver brook being the dividing line. Forty pounds were raised by taxation, and any additional expense to be otherwise raised." In 1734 the town voted that, "There shall be three schools, one of which shall be a grammar school—the others English schools—the grammar master to go from one school to another." Two years later, however, the town meeting had again changed its mind, and it was voted "to employ one master to keep 2 months in the South Range, 2 months in the Double Range, 2 months in the Aiken's Range, 2 months in the Back Range, 2 months in the English Range, 1 month in the Park, and 1 month in Canada."

The votes of these old town meetings, moreover, lead one to believe that there was as little stability in the amounts of money for school support as there was in the shifting schools and schoolhouses. The town of Swanzey [33] gives a very good example of this. In 1775 it was "Voted to raise Twenty Pounds for schooling," but at a later meeting the same year it was "Voted to apply the Twenty Pounds which was granted to hire schooling towards paying the Province Tax."

---

[28] *New Hampshire School Report*, 1876, p. 189.

[29] *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 195.

[30] *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 199.

[31] *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 188.

[32] *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 199.

1776. Voted not to raise any money for schooling.
1777. Voted to raise 20 pounds.
1778. Voted to raise 50 pounds.
1782. Raised 60 pounds.
1783. Raised 41 pounds, 10 shillings.
1784. Raised 59 pounds, 3 shillings, 3 pence.
1785. Raised 30 pounds, and "voted to pay Sarah Woodcock 22 shillings for her services in schooling in the past year in this town."
1786. Raised 59 pounds, 17 shillings, 9 pence.
1791. Raised 60 pounds.

The salaries of teachers varied from town to town, there having been no standard other than that which was local. The historian of the schools of the town of [34] Orford remarks that, in 1771 "An instructor was secured an almost incredible length of time for an incredibly small sum of money," and one reads that in 1780 the same town voted sixty bushels of wheat to pay the teacher for services and board. In describing the growth of the school system in the town of Dublin one writer observes [35] that, "In the year 1773 we find the first account of a public appropriation for schools which was a grant of four pounds ($13.33) 'to keep a woman's school in three parts of the town,' which would give each school $4.44. At 44 cents per week—the usual price in those days—this would employ a teacher, if she "boarded round," ten weeks in each of the three places."

It must not be thought, however, that the apparent unwillingness of the towns to remunerate their teachers generously represented their true estimate of the value and dignity of the schoolmaster's calling. Always it must be remembered that the period was one of hardship and scantiness of funds, and that the schoolmasters were being paid relatively well. That there must have been felt a spirit of respect for the teacher is shown by the fact that a legislative act of 1718[36] "for the Regulating of the Militia" classes schoolmasters with the important personages of the state who are "exempted from all military Training," and that, in 1721 the law[37] was made to exempt them, together with other citizens of importance, from all obligation to perform labor upon the public highways.

---

[33] *New Hampshire School Report*, 1876, p. 195.

[34] *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 262.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 232.

A reading of all these provisions for schools reveals the fact that the movement toward "district" management and support of schools, although not legalized in New Hampshire until 1805, was well on the way in practical usage many years before that time. The towns were already beginning to split up into "local schools," either through the agency of the itinerant school or permanent schools located in different parts of the towns. Thus it may well be said that the districting movement, which came to a close in 1885 in New Hampshire, had its beginning more than a hundred years before. The spirit of the times was a "local" spirit. The "district" spirit was even more "local" than that of the towns. But administratively this period of the Colonial schools was that of the towns, the policy being determined through the town meetings, and all techniques for its realization being developed by the selectmen, or other elected agents of the voters of the towns.

> The schools of this century and a half were not free schools, they were unsupervised, they were taught by itinerant or non-professional teachers, the terms were short, the enforcement of the law was of limited local application, no provision was made for the education of girls, no school records were kept, and no school reports made. As a result during these years ignorance and illiteracy were very common, except that the ideal persisted that qualified and patriotic parents should teach their own children. This alone prevented learning from being "buried in the grave of our fathers." Still gain was made in the acceptance of the belief that the state must educate its children.[38]

Dr. George G. Bush, in his *History of Education in New Hampshire*[39] says that,

---

[36] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period,* Vol. II, Chap. 21, 1718.

[37] *Ibid.,* Vol. II, Chap. 6, 1721.

[38] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1923-1924, p. 44.

[39] Bush, George G., *History of Education in New Hampshire,* p. 12. United States Bureau of Education, 1898.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century until near its close there was great apathy in the matter of maintaining schools, the law respecting education being but partially enforced. Mr. Jeremy Belknap, the historian of New Hampshire, says that "when the leading men in town were themselves persons of knowledge and wisdom they would provide the means of instruction for children; but when the case was otherwise, methods were found to evade the law. . . . It was the interest," he says, "of ignorant and unprincipled men to discourage literature, because it would detract from their importance and expose them to contempt." Furthermore, the neglect of schools was "one among many evidences of a most unhappy prostration of morals during that period. It afforded a melancholy prospect to the friends of science and of virtue and excited some generous and philanthropic persons to devise other methods of education." Among those who at this time came forward to awaken interest in the cause of education was the Hon. John Phillips, of Exeter. As an earnest of his intense convictions on this subject he founded and endowed a seminary of learning which in 1781 "was by an act of assembly incorporated by the name of Phillips Exeter Academy." Other towns soon followed the example set by Exeter and opened either private schools or academies, and the beginning was laid for that academic history in New Hampshire which is believed to have no parallel in the history of the other states of the Union.

It should be noted that this apathy in education and educational endeavor in New Hampshire during the eighteenth century had rather far-reaching results as concerns the matter of state and local control and administration in school matters. The public neglect in providing school facilities, especially in secondary education, had stirred the interest of that zealous minority who feared the consequences of this lack, and led to the establishment of a great system of private schools under private control. The whole matter is well put in the *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report* for 1923-1924, when it says:

> The law of 1647 clearly considered high school opportunities as a part of the public obligation. It can be seen that this was an ideal that in a new and poor country could from its very cost find no general acceptance. This brought about a most interesting educational development, the period of the growth, recognition and decay of the New England academy. The period covers a full century in our history, and was at its height about 1860, but was then passing the period of its greatest vigor. At this time over one hundred schools had been chartered or had been active for a brief period.[40]

The first public high school in New Hampshire was established at Portsmouth in 1830, but it was not until the close of the nineteenth century that the public high school really superseded the academy as the source of secondary education in the state. And so it may reasonably be said that secondary education in New Hampshire was, for over a century, in the hands and under the control and support of private and local organizations. It was almost entirely free from any kind of state or other public supervision and direction except as these are given to any institution of an organized society. Such was the far-reaching effects of public apathy and private zeal in the matter of education in New Hampshire in the eighteenth century.

---

[40] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1923-1924, p. 64.

In general, then, it may be said that education in New Hampshire in the colonial and Province period was a matter of local enterprise and management. True, the state lawmakers entered statutes in the law books which declared that the local towns and communities must do thus and so regarding the establishment, maintenance, and conducting of schools, but in actual practice the amount and quality of schooling which any community gave to its children depended almost entirely upon the character of the community and its attitude toward education. A consideration of available data leads one to conclude that the pre-Revolutionary period in New Hampshire developed little that we would to-day care to distinguish by the term "school system." The period did some very creditable things, educationally, but they were due rather more to private enterprise and love of learning of the people than to any inherent strength and efficacy of the organized public policy toward education. One cannot but feel that things must have been in an unhappy state, educationally, to make Governor Wentworth declare in a message to the Assembly in 1771 that "nine-tenths of your towns are wholly without schools or having vagrant teachers . . . worse than none . . . unknown in principle and deplorably illiterate."[41] The *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report* for 1923-1924 is probably not far from the truth when it says, in closing a discussion of the law of 1771 that, "This was the last educational act of His Majesty's Loyal and Obedient Legislature and marks one hundred and fifty years of educational stagnation."[42]

This one-hundred-and-fifty-year Colonial period of the old New Hampshire town schools fails to show the development of a single new progressive principle in school organization, administration, and support beyond those laid down in the original act of 1647, unless one considers the beginning of the "district system" to be progressive. Later laws had trifled with details, but had not made any really important change in the general principles of public school policy. To the end the Colonial period remained that of the local school, locally supported, locally administered, and locally evaluated. The only insistence of the state had been that there be schools in the settlements, supported in *some way,* and conducted *somehow.*

---

[41] *New Hampshire Province Papers*, Vol. VII, p. 287.

[42] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 44.

CHAPTER V

THE PERIOD OF DISTRICT DOMINATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOLS

It has been noted in a previous chapter that, in the years following the Revolution, New Hampshire experienced a large growth in population, and a great increase in new settlements which had opened up hitherto unoccupied lands. The result was growth of new communities which were too remote from the town centers to be able to send their children to the distant town schools. The law of 1721[1] had made it compulsory for these Parishes to maintain schools separate from the town, and the strong spirit of "localism" pushed forward the development of these isolated districts. Following the Revolution, the movement grew apace, and the history of New Hampshire educational organization, administration, and support for the next century, almost, is primarily that of the attempt of the people of the state to manipulate this district organization in some way to bring about the realization of their educational ideals. Although the "districting law" was not passed until 1805, the influence of the movement was felt much earlier, and it is proper to include the post-Revolutionary period previous to 1805 in a discussion of this phase of New Hampshire's school development.

In the absence of enabling legislation, the towns had responded to the needs of the time, and had created self-governing districts by their own town authority. We read[2] that in 1782 the town of Dublin voted $26.67 for schools, and the selectmen were instructed "to divide the town into five parts for schooling, and give each part their proportion of school money; and each part shall lay out their money within the year in such schooling as they think best." Likewise, it is recorded that in the town of Salem, "In 1798 the town chose a committee to divide the town into districts or 'classes,' which was done, but their plan was rejected. May 12, 1800, the town voted to divide the town into districts, and have a schoolhouse built in each district. Nine districts were set off, and school opened in all." [3] That such cases of division of the towns into districts previous to the "districting law" of 1805 were not unusual, but were, in truth, very representative, is attested by any thorough examination of the records of the late eighteenth century town meetings. We read that in the town of Andover as early as 1779 the selectmen were voted a committee to "set the town off into districts," and "the districting, redistricting, dividing, annexing and forming new districts, make a very prominent part of the records of the town, and must have been a source of constant perplexity." [4]

---

[1] *Laws of New Hampshire, Province Period*, Vol. II, Chap. 3, Laws of 1721.

[2] *New Hampshire School Report*, 1876, p. 233.

It seems plain, then, that the "districting law" of 1805 did not create the district system of school administration and support in New Hampshire. It merely legalized and made uniform a practice which already prevailed throughout the settlements.

It should be noted that throughout this "period of the district" up to 1885 there was an insistent and ever-increasing disposition on the part of the state to demand the right to dictate educational policy and practice to the local communities. It must not be thought that the rather high degree of state power which has come to prevail in New Hampshire's educational system is a result of a sudden and revolutionary change. It has been a matter of slow growth, of accretion from much experimentation, failure, and success, and of rather stubborn surrender of what had traditionally been cherished as fundamental principles of democratic society. Nor must the mistake be made of supposing that there was ever a time when there was not some state power in local educational affairs. The very existence of state law authorizing, permitting, or prescribing the establishment and conducting of schools is an evidence of authority to which school districts are subordinate. The districts themselves had existence only through sufferance of the state law. Such powers as they exercised were theirs only because the people chose to delegate a task to this particular instrument of social labor rather than to some other which they might have employed. Repeatedly during this period the lawmakers of New Hampshire did turn from the school district to other machinery of administration in an attempt to solve their school problems and achieve the desired educational ends. But in the main the forms of educational organization, machinery of administration, and types of financial support stamp this period from 1805 to 1885 as rather distinctly that of "district domination."

---

[3] *New Hampshire School Report,* 1876, p. 240.

[4] *Ibid.,* 1876, p. 247.

When the American Revolution came to a close and the organization of the new nation was begun, New Hampshire was among the first to adopt a state constitution. It was drawn up in 1793, thus antedating the federal constitution. The national constitution makes no mention of education, but the New Hampshire fundamental law, in an article almost exactly like a provision in the Massachusetts constitution, gives very specific and generous attention to the problem of schools and learning. In Article 82 is set forth this New Hampshire point of view.

It reads:

> Knowledge and learning generally diffused through a community being essential to the preservation of a free government, and spreading the opportunities and advantages of education through the various parts of the country being highly conducive to promote this end, it shall be the duty of the legislators and magistrates, in all future periods of this government, to cherish the interest of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries and public schools; to encourage private and public institutions, rewards and immunities for the promotion of agriculture, arts, sciences, commerce, trades, manufactures and natural history of the country; to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and economy, honesty and punctuality, sincerity, sobriety and all social affections and generous sentiments, among the people; provided, nevertheless, that no money raised by taxation shall ever be granted or applied for the use of the schools or institutions of any religious sect or denomination.

Even before this, in 1789, the state had set out on a program of legislation to apply the general principles enunciated in the constitution. It would seem that the people of New Hampshire were not unaware of the shortcomings of their educational institutions, for their lawmakers begin the act of 1789 with a preamble which declares that,

> Whereas the Laws respecting Schools have been found not to answer the important end for which they were made; Therefore—
>
> Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, that all the laws of this state respecting schools be, and they hereby are, repealed.[5]

[5] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. V, Chap. 8, Session Laws of 1789.

There is nothing of equivocation in this declaration of New Hampshire's 1789 lawmakers. And they did not hesitate to prescribe strong medicine for bad disease. It has been noted in the previous chapter that quantity of school funds all during the Colonial Period was purely a matter for local town decision. The law had required only that schools be maintained, leaving the matter of financial support to the whims of the various town meetings. The result had been almost complete absence of any dependable policy in school support. The legislature of 1789 drove directly to the heart of this problem by withdrawing from the local towns all power to determine a possible minimum school tax by declaring,

> . . . that the Selectmen of the Several towns and Parishes within this State, be and they hereby are impowered and required to assess annually the Inhabitants of their respective towns, according to their polls and ratable estates in a sum to be computed at the rate of 5 pounds for every twenty shillings of the proportion for public taxes . . . which sums, when collected, shall be applyed to the sole purpose of keeping an English Grammar School or Schools for teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic.[6]

This gave, at the time, an amount equal to five thousand pounds for the whole state, or about $25,000. Provision was made that in shire and half-shire towns grammar schools were to be maintained for teaching Greek and Latin in addition to the usual branches taught in the English Grammar schools. Thus was introduced into New Hampshire a new procedure in school taxation. It was distinctly a move toward centralization of power and state control. It set a minimum below which local school taxes must not go. This principle has never been surrendered, and acting upon it the state, through almost a hundred and forty years of legislation, has set higher and higher the figure at which local school meetings might begin their deliberations regarding proper amounts for school support. Always these local meetings have possessed power to set any desired maximum, provided it be at least as much as the state-wide minimum. Moreover, this act of 1789 prescribed that,

> . . . no person shall be deemed qualified to keep any such School, unless he produce a certificate from some able and reputable School master and learned Minister, or Preceptor of some Academy or President of some College; that he is well qualified to keep such school.

[6] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. V, Chap. 8, Session Laws of 1789.

We see reflected in this first New Hampshire school legislation following the Revolution the belief that the larger unit of control, the state, could properly require the local communities, through their town authorities, to observe certain standards of curricula, financial obligations and practices as regards employment of teachers. Results proved that it was a decided step forward, in that the old repealed laws which this superseded had failed to secure desirable educational conditions because of local inefficiency in enforcement, and more because school appropriations had been dependent upon the frequently changed opinions and faulty conceptions of towns and boards of selectmen.

In 1791[7] this act was amended to raise the assessment to the proportion of seven pounds, ten shillings, instead of the previous five pounds. This would seem to indicate that any local opposition to the demands of the state as expressed in the Law of 1789 had not been potent, and that the friends of increased educational attainment had found state legislation and decision in the matter of school support superior to any provision which local boards had been willing to give in the past. And the fact that four days after the passage of the 1791 law the legislature voted to procure two hundred printed copies of "the school act of the present session to distribute to the Several towns in this state"[8] probably indicates a determination to inform local authorities of the provisions of the law and then to insist that it be enforced.

This law was followed by another in 1804[9] "for the better regulation of schools within this State, and for the repealing all laws now in force respecting the same." This act differed from those which had immediately preceded only in that it laid a tax upon the improved and unimproved lands and buildings of non-residents as well as residents, that, due to the great increase in the number of academies and their teaching of the higher branches, it left out the provision regarding maintenance of Greek and Latin schools in shire and half-shire towns, and that the word "she" was included, as well as "he" in the provision regarding teachers' certificates, making the law read, "unless he or she produce a certificate." The act provided, moreover, that the school tax should be raised from $35 to $45 for every dollar of the town's proportion of the public taxes.

[7] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. V, Chap. 7, Session Laws of 1791.

[8] *Ibid.,* Vol. V, p. 781, Resolves of the Session of 1791.

[9] *Ibid.,* Vol. VII, Chap. 30, Session Laws of 1804.

A study of each modification in this series of laws reveals a growing insistence on the part of the state legislature that it should act "for the better regulation of schools within this State" rather than leave that "better regulation" to the action of local authorities. Especially was there shown an increasing tendency in the state government to take over the former powers upon which local communities had insisted to determine the local tax rate for the support of purely local school enterprise.

And then, in 1805, amid all these movements toward increased state power and a larger administrative unit, came the famous "districting law." [10]

The act begins with what would seem to be a rather harmless provision that,

> . . . the several Towns and places within this State, be, and they hereby are respectively empowered at any legal meeting for that purpose, to divide into School Districts, and to define the limits thereof, and the same from time to time to alter in such manner as shall be thought fit and convenient.[11]

The law then gives to each school district, thus formed by the division of a town, power to raise money by tax for the purpose of erecting, repairing, or purchasing a schoolhouse, and for buying all necessary utensils for the same; to determine in what part of the district to erect a schoolhouse, with a provision that the selectmen of the town are to locate it for the district if the voters thereof cannot agree upon a location. All qualified town voters were authorized to vote in the affairs of the district where they lived, and in general the law gave to the districts all powers in conducting schools formerly possessed by the towns.

In the light of over a hundred years of experience, it is easy to point out the fundamental weaknesses of this law. But it must be remembered always that it was passed to meet a condition which prevailed in 1805. At the time of its enactment, it was quite necessary, and greatly enlarged the facilities for education by increasing the number of schools and leading to the erection of new and more convenient schoolhouses. Previous to this the school was not infrequently an itinerant institution, finding a "local habitation" as best it could, sometimes in a private residence, at others in a workshop, and occasionally in a barn or other out-building which could be made to serve. Probably no one would condemn the people of the town of Salem for enthusiastically supporting any law which would definitely fix districts and provide for permanent schoolhouses when he reads that in 1744, "The school was kept in four places, the same master being sent to different neighborhoods, and occupying a room in some farmhouse, making it both his schoolhouse and place of abode." [12]

---

[10] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. VII, Chap. 39, Session Laws of 1805.

[11] *Ibid.*

The "districting law" of 1805 was certainly passed for good and pressing reasons. But a study of the history of New Hampshire pursuant of its enactment shows that the dividing and subdividing into districts increased until the school units, in a too great number of cases, were so small as to make effective support absolutely impossible. Conditions in many parts of the state, especially in rural districts, came to such a pass that, only through decisive action, which wrested the control of educational policies in these districts from the hands of local authorities and placed it in the hands of a wider and more centralized authority, was educational petrifaction averted. It is not too much to say that the Law of 1805, as much as any other single educational act of the State of New Hampshire, laid the basis for the rather acute condition which resulted in the educational investigation of 1918, and the Law of 1919, under which, with some few changes and amendments, the school system of the state is now operating. Massachusetts, in 1789, had passed a law similar to the 1805 law of New Hampshire, and Horace Mann in speaking of it said, "I consider the law of 1789, authorizing towns to divide themselves into districts, the most unfortunate law on the subject of common schools ever enacted in the state." [13]

The "districting law" was not, then, passed in a spirit of stubborn localism which was insistent that educational virtue lay only in local control. It was an honest attempt to solve a problem by the best means at hand. It merely exchanged one local instrument for another—the town for the district. That it was not a conscious thrust at the growing power of the state nor an expression of resentment at interference with local rights seems fairly shown by the fact that only two years later, in 1807,[14] the legislature raised the minimum for local school taxes to $70 for every dollar of the public tax apportionment in the towns. Thus

[12] *New Hampshire School Report*, 1876, p. 240.

[13] *Tenth Report of Secretary of Massachusetts State Board of Education*, p. 130.

[14] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. VII, Chap. 51, Session Laws of 1807.

in the eighteen years from 1789, the minimum had been raised from $5 for one to $70 for one, or fourteen times as much. Moreover, the very next year, in 1808, another act was passed [15] which made a beginning on some rather important educational policies, and indicated the determination of friends of education to bring pressure through the state government upon the local communities to the end that educational standards be raised. In addition to previous credentials demanded of a candidate for teaching, this act stipulated that there should be "a certificate from the selectmen, or minister of the town or parish, to which he or she belongs, that he or she sustains a good moral character, and the said certificates be presented to the selectmen or committee for inspecting schools in the town or parish in which school is to be kept, *previous* to the commencement of such school." [16]

This law of 1808 is of real significance in that here, for the first time in New Hampshire law, "schoolmistresses" were given specific legal recognition. It is interesting to note, however, that they were given a specifically lower classification than schoolmasters, for the law reads:

> That the literary qualifications of school mistresses be required to extend no farther than that they are able to teach the various sounds and powers of the letters in the English language, reading, writing and English grammar; granting them the liberty always of teaching such other branches of female education as may be deemed necessary to be taught in schools under their tuition.[17]

From the very beginning of the New Hampshire settlements the selectmen of the towns had exercised the right of general control and supervision of the educational work of the local communities. But in this law of 1808 the state, through legal action, launched a program of supervision and school inspection which fixed a type and established a tradition of supervision which was to prove, in the end, harmful to the schools and their work. It provided that,

> . . . each town in this state, shall at their annual meeting, appoint three, or more suitable persons, whose duty it shall be to visit and inspect the schools, annually in their respective towns and parishes, at such times as may be most convenient for the parties concerned, and in a manner which

---

[15] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. VII, Chap. 60, Session Laws of 1808.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*

they may judge most conducive to the progress of literature, morality and religion; and in case any town neglect to appoint such persons, the duty of inspecting schools shall then devolve upon the selectmen of such town.[18]

At the time of its passage this act supplied a genuine need. The population of the state was increasing rapidly. New settlements were being made, new communities established. The "districting law" of 1805 had made it possible for these new portions of towns to build schoolhouses and have schools in their own neighborhoods, as was good and just for the time. And now, with this great increase in the number of schools, the duties heaped upon the selectmen of the towns were, no doubt, becoming burdensome. Thus the law attempted to bring relief by providing that this committee be appointed to supervise and inspect the schools. It is significant that over a century ago these lawmakers recognized the need of some kind of supervision for the individual schools. They did the best they could in their time. But the program of non-professional supervision which the act formally inaugurated, and which was to grow into the system of local superintending committees, fastened itself so firmly upon the schools and the school tradition of New Hampshire that only after educational conditions became almost intolerable in the latter part of the century was it possible for professional educators to convince the people of the state that the supervision of educational work is a profession in itself, and not to be done efficiently and profitably by a non-professional committee.

Before passing to consideration of other developments, it should be noted, too, that this law of 1808 represented the insistence of the state that the course of study be broadened and enriched. Heretofore, the state in its legal demands, and the local communities in their practice, had provided only for the famous and traditional three R's. This 1808 act stipulated that there be taught, "The various sounds and powers of the letters in the English Language, reading, writing, English Grammar, arithmetic, geography and such other branches of education as it may be necessary to teach in an English School." A consideration of available data convinces one that what was true in 1808 has been, in the main, true in all the years since, namely, that the local communities will continue almost indefinitely to offer the traditional and established course of study in schools, and that any appreciable elaboration or readjusting of curricula must come through the insistent legal suggestion of the state power. It is interesting to note, however, that this has not been universally true, for we read in an historical sketch of the schools of the town of South Hampton that,[19]

---

[18] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. VII, Chap. 60, Session Laws of 1808.

> Another important feature of the schools of those days was the practice of needlework by the girls. This after a time was discountenanced, as occupying time which should be spent in study. One district voted, in 1823, that no needlework should be brought into school.

Evidently "Domestic Science" was in the curriculum of South Hampton's little school long before any "State Course of Study" had suggested or prescribed.

For the next ten years New Hampshire education proceeded without other school legislation. It was a time of prosperity, of expanding settlements and population increase. The established school policy seemed to meet existing needs. The evils growing out of the "districting law" had not begun to show, since the rural depopulating movement incident to the westward migrations and the Industrial Revolution had not started. And when, in 1818, after a lapse of ten years, school legislation was again undertaken, it merely extended and continued the established policy. The assessment for schools was raised by legislative enactment [20] to $90 for every dollar of the apportionment of public taxes, for the sole purpose of supporting English schools in the towns for teaching "reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, geography, and other necessary branches of education," and "including the purchase of necessary wood or fuel for such schools." This was the beginning of the end of that period in which patrons of the schools had paid their school obligation by delivering firewood to the schoolhouse and boarding the teacher "round." Trivial as this may seem, it represented a rather fundamental change in attitude in the matter of publicly supported education.

In tracing the development of the state school system, we are brought to the establishment of the Literary Fund by an act of the legislature [21] on June 29, 1821. This fund has remained from that day to this as a source of financial assistance to education in New Hampshire. The act originally provided that it was to be for the sole use and purpose of endowing or supporting a college for instruction in the higher branches of science and literature, and to be appropriated to this purpose as the legislature should appoint. The act provided that no banking corporation should issue or circulate any bills, notes, or obligations, unless they had been stamped by the Treasurer of State with some appropriate stamp and approved by the governor, and said corporations were to pay at or after the rate of $50 for every $1,000 in bills, notes, or obligations thus stamped. They might, instead, pay an annual tax of one-half of one per cent on their capital stock. This alternative really became the law. The idea of a college was abandoned, however, in 1828, and the accumulated fund of $64,000 was distributed by the legislature to the towns according to the public tax apportionment to be used for support of common schools. There have been various modifications in the provisions for distribution of the fund. In 1848 the law [22] made it the duty of the state to distribute the fund among the several towns and places in the state, according to the number of scholars, not less than four years of age, who are reported by the superintending school committee to the secretary of state as having attended the district common school for at least two weeks during the year preceding the making of the report.

---

[19] *New Hampshire School Report,* 1876, p. 193.

[20] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. VIII, Chap. 61, Session Laws of 1818.

[21] *Ibid.,* Vol. IX, Chap. 27, Session Laws of 1821.

For the ten years beginning with 1847, the fund totaled $188,240.70. In 1876 the fund amounted to about $27,000.00, 43 cents for each pupil in the state. In 1890 it was $53,665.69, in 1900 the fund had reduced to $36,768.76 per year, and in 1926 it was $45,265.13. The Public Laws of New Hampshire, 1926, includes the Literary Fund in a general fund for education with "all money appropriated by the legislature for general educational purposes." [23]

It is interesting to note that the state has often used this Fund as a spur to obedience of the school law. It was stipulated, for example, in 1848 that none of the Literary Fund should go to districts delinquent in their school reports to the state. Also, state aid, through the fund, has been made a "bait" to secure increased local support of schools. But one is led to believe that the administration of the fund by the state has not always been defensible, nor its local uses always wholly ethical, for we read [24]

[22] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 738, Session Laws of 1848.

[23] *Public Laws of New Hampshire,* 1926, Title XIII, Chap. 116, Sec. 14.

[24] *New Hampshire School Report,* 1876, p. 249.

that in the town of Andover in 1863 the report of the Superintending School Committee to the town says:

> For instruction in the higher branches of science and literature a Literary Fund was created by the state, June 29, 1821. It was divided among the towns for free schools, by act, Dec. 31, 1828. Additions were made to your share of this fund, until it would seem to have been $1,500. It was sacredly kept for the avowed purpose of fitting, in towns, children that chose, up to the college course, at the public charge. In 1837 local prejudices and madness set aside this purpose, and the town then spent this money for pauper, muster, highway, and the like. It was an indirect, unmanly mode of stealing, from children in cradles and from those unborn, a right to an education, without giving even a "mess of pottage" therefor.

It is a long march in administrative practice from that which permitted a town meeting boldly to vote legal state school funds to other town uses in 1837 to the condition which prevails ninety years later in which such misappropriation could result only from felonious juggling of vouchers and records.

On July 6, 1827, the legislature passed an act upon the subject of education which greatly amplified and defined the administrative machinery of the district system. It marks a milepost in the evolution of New Hampshire educational administrative practice. As has been noted in connection with the law of 1808, the schools had, during all the history of the settlements and towns, been considered as but an item in the town business, and the selectmen had directed their support and administration. "A special duty of selectmen has ever been to guard the town business and finances, and the schools suffered as long as their maintenance was regarded as a common expenditure. In 1827 the law separated the school government and administration from town affairs by requiring a town school committee in addition to the several district committees of the town." [25] This provision read that,

> . . . there shall be appointed by the selectmen annually, in the month of March in each town, a superintending School Committee, consisting of not less than three nor more than five persons, whose duty it shall be to examine schoolmasters and school mistresses proposing to teach school therein. And it shall be the duty of said Committee, or one or more of them, to visit and inspect all the schools in their respective towns, at least twice in each year, and to inquire into the regulations and discipline thereof, and the proficiency of the scholars therein, and to use their influence and best endeavors that the youth in the several districts attend the schools.

---

[25] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 47.

> And the said committee shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to dismiss any schoolmaster or school-mistress who shall be found by them, or a majority of them, incapable or unfit to teach such school notwithstanding he or she may have procured the necessary certificates.
>
> It shall be the duty of said Superintending Committees of the several towns in the state, to direct and determine the class books, to be used in the respective classes, in the several towns, to which they belong; and the scholars attending such schools shall be supplied by their parents, masters, or guardians with the books so prescribed by said Committees.[26]

The act provided, however, that if parents or those having children in the schools should fail to furnish the necessary books, the selectmen were to procure them at town expense and charge them in the tax account of the negligent parties. If it should be felt that the parents were too poor to furnish them, the selectmen were to buy the books, and the charge was not to be made on the tax list. Thus it is seen that the first wedge was entered in the struggle to secure free textbooks for children in the schools, although it began in a method which practically pauperized those who used books at the public expense. In 1846 the legislature again attempted "free textbook" legislation on a pauperizing basis, and it was not until July 30, 1889, that textbooks at public expense were made the right and not the stigma of New Hampshire school children.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the lawmakers were insistent that the public schools should not become the instrument of propaganda of a religious nature, for this 1827 law stipulates that,

> . . . said committee shall never direct any school books to be purchased or used in any of the schools under their superintendence, which are calculated to favor any particular religious sect or tenet.[27]

In this law of 1827 was the beginning, too, of that instrument of school administration known as the school Prudential Committee. The work and effect of this committee in the school district affairs of New Hampshire are to be seen from this time to 1885. It was born of a section of the 1827 law which provided that,

> . . . there shall be chosen at the annual meeting in the month of March in each of the towns in this State, a district committee, consisting of one person for each school district, who shall be resident in the district for

---

[26] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. IX, Chap. 57, Session Laws of 1827.

[27] *Ibid.*

> which he shall be chosen, and be called the Prudential Committee thereof; whose duty it shall be to select and contract with the teachers for his district, to provide for their board, to furnish the necessary fuel for the school and immediately on the commencement of any such school in his district to give information thereof to the Superintending committee of the town.
>
> Provided, that in any town in this state, which shall at any legal meeting holden for that purpose so determine, the Prudential Committee may be chosen in the several school districts, to which they respectively belong in such manner as said district may decide.[28]

Thus two committees were provided for—the Prudential Committee and the Superintending Committee. To the former was given the direction of the business affairs of the school and the selecting and employment of the teachers. To the latter was given the duties and powers of certifying the teacher, and supervising the work of the school to the end that it function efficiently as an instrument for imparting education. It was a vague recognition of the present, rather well-established principle of educational administration that there are two functions to be performed in conducting an educational system: the one of a wide policy-formulating type, and best performed by a board of laymen; and the other professional and pedagogical, and best directed by someone with professional training. That the attempts to provide for these two functions which were made in 1827 were crude and ultimately largely fruitless, is not to be denied, but it must be remembered always that it was not possible at that time to provide professional supervision for the schools. There were no professional supervisors available, and there was then a practically unanimous opinion, which unfortunately is still held by a too great number of people in every part of the nation, that any fairly well-educated person knows how to "run a school," and is able to create and provide a proper educational program, and to supervise and dictate profitable methods for its realization. The evils which grew up through a division of responsibilities, and community meddling, through its committee, in strictly professional phases of the school's work make up a large part of the story of such inefficiency as led finally to the Law of 1919, almost a century later.

There is seen in this law, too, the continued insistence of the state on its right to supplant local standards regarding teacher qualification by state-wide and state imposed standards of fitness. True, those imposed standards were not high, but the principle that the state might judge better of these matters than could the people of any little local community was contained in the law. It provided that,

---

[28] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. IX, Chap. 57, Session Laws of 1827.

> . . . no person shall be employed as a schoolmaster in any of the schools aforesaid, unless he shall be a citizen of the United States, and shall produce a certificate from the Superintending School Committee of the town where such school is to be kept, and also from some person of liberal education, literary pursuits, and good moral character that he is well qualified to instruct youth in the various sounds and powers of the letters in the English Language, reading, writing, English Grammar, arithmetic, geography, and such other branches of education as may be proper to be taught in an English school; and also a certificate from the selectmen of the town to which he belongs, in case there be any, otherwise from three of the most reputable inhabitants thereof, that to the best of their knowledge he is a person of sober life and conversation, and of good moral character.[29]

It would seem that this is the first law in the history of the state in which a teacher is not required to have some kind of credentials from a minister of the gospel in order to secure a certificate to teach. It marks the beginning of the end of that long period of almost two centuries in New Hampshire in which the minister was looked upon as the one most competent to judge of education, and school procedures and qualifications. It was just another small step in the long and hesitant march to the time when schools and their administration and teaching are to be looked upon not as a proper field for learned "jacks-of-all-trades"—well-meaning persons who are extremely well versed in the demands of their own professions—but are thought to require the services of professionally trained educational workers who have studied the techniques and methods of the process of organizing educational institutions and imparting educational materials.

This 1827 Law continued the distinction between the qualifications of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses. It provided, moreover, that superintending committees should make an annual report to the town meeting, and required the towns to give "reasonable compensation" to these committees for their services.

With the great increase in the number of schools incident to the rapid growth of population and the "districting law" of 1805, there arose trouble over the location of schoolhouses and school grounds. We find the legislature passing on July 6, 1827, a law[30] providing that, if an owner refuses to sell the school site chosen by a district, action may be brought as under the highway act, the land may be condemned, and the owner may be given such remuneration as an assessment of damages finds proper. The land is to revert to the owner, if use for school purposes is discontinued. The act further provides that,

---

[29] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Vol. IX, Chap. 57, Session Laws of 1827.

> If any school district is now, or hereafter shall become, destitute of a school house, or if the school house in any district is now, or hereafter shall become, ruinous and out of repair, and the inhabitants thereof shall refuse or neglect to build, purchase, or repair their school house. . . .[31]

then the selectmen may assess upon the delinquent district, on the petition of three or more freeholder residents thereof, and use the funds for making such repairs, or building such school buildings as they may deem necessary. No longer was the stubbornness, lethargy, or incompetence of some small local community to have the sanction of the state law in depriving its children of the right to a "little red schoolhouse," in order that the "sacred right of local self-government" might not be outraged. Neglect and flaunting of the law brought deplorable housing conditions in some of the communities of the state for the next hundred years, as shall be noted later, but the principle that the state might determine proper condition of the local schoolhouse at the crossroads was firmly established, and there has been no let-up in the insistence on the part of the larger governmental unit—the state—that the local communities raise higher and higher architectural and sanitary standards for their schoolhouses.

Following the "great Law of 1827" came a large number of amending and modifying acts, for the most part dealing with the powers, duties, election, and other detailed matters of the superintending and prudential committees. The state had laid down the general principles of a policy of school administration and taxation, built around the district as the unit of greatest power and influence, and now set out through legislation to work out the details of the problem. In 1829 came an amendment[32] which provided that the prudential committees should be chosen by "each school district" instead of the towns, and also that it should consist "of one or more persons, not exceeding three." The original act of 1827 had provided for only one member of the committee, and for one committee for the entire town. On January 4, 1833, it was provided[33] that vacancies in the office of prudential or superintending committees should be filled through appointment by the selectmen of the town, three freeholders of the affected districts having petitioned. This act also stipulated that,

---

[30] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Vol. IX, Chap. 58, Session Laws of 1827.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Ibid.,* Chap. 61, Session Laws of 1829.

> . . . any town in this state may . . . dispense with the services of their Superintending School Committee so far as relates to the inspection and examination of schools.

This was repealed on July 6, 1846, and the system of lay supervision again made compulsory. Provision was also made in this act of 1833 that, if any prudential committee "shall not manage the financial or other prudential affairs of said district for the advantage of the same," the selectmen of the town may, if petitioned by a majority of the legal voters of the district, dismiss said delinquent member, and are empowered to fill the vacancy created.

By an act[34] of July 5, 1833, it was made the duty of selectmen of the towns to "assign to each school district in their respective towns and places a proportion of the money assessed in each year for the support of schools according to the valuation thereof for that year, unless the said towns and places shall at a meeting holden for that purpose direct it to be divided according to the number of scholars in each district."

This was but one of the first guns in that long battle which has raged over the distribution of school funds in the state, and for almost a century now the struggle has gone on in an attempt to arrive at some method of distribution which will be fair to "Property," and at the same time give the unfortunate child in the "poor district" fair and equitable opportunity of education which the economically favored child enjoys. The whole problem would never arise, of course, were pupils distributed equally among the districts and in such numbers as would make possible a uniform per capita cost of standard instruction, and if property were also distributed equally among the districts of the state, thereby yield-ing uniform financial support for schools without any disproportionate tax levies. These ideal conditions, however, have prevailed less and less in New Hampshire as social and economic forces have more and more concentrated both children and wealth and left numerous towns and districts with decreased population and depleted economic conditions. Exactly here was the ulcer which was eating at the vitals of the "district plan," and which was destined to do it to death in spite of all the deep-seated tradition of "local self-government." Resort in the end was had to the state as a unit of distribution, and equalization of educational opportunity was attempted through the agency of "state aid" in the closing years of the nineteenth century.

---

[33] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 42, Session Laws of 1833.

[34] *Ibid.*, Chap. 28, Laws, June Session 1833.

The "districting law" of 1805 had granted towns power to subdivide into school districts if they wished, but on July 6, 1839, an act was passed stipulating that if towns did not voluntarily so divide,

> The selectmen, on application being made to them in writing by ten legal voters, a majority of whom are free holders, of such town to proceed forthwith properly to divide said town into school districts, and define the boundaries of the same.[35]

This provision seemed not to secure the desired results, for in 1843 the law was further amended by a provision which assessed a fine of $100 upon the selectmen of any town who failed to divide it into districts, on application of ten legal voters. This mandatory act completed the "districting movement," and although some of the most important towns had, through special legislative act, long since returned to the town system after trying the district plan, it may be said that the year 1843 practically marks the high-water mark of the district plan of organization, administration, and support. In spite of the fact that the evil effects and administrative organization of the districts were to continue for almost a half century more, the movement had reached its climax, legislatively, and on July 3, 1845, came the first legal move back toward centralization. A law was passed[36] providing that, "any two or more contiguous districts in any town or towns" might, by vote of two-thirds of the legal voters of the districts concerned unite for the purpose of maintaining a high school. Then on July 15, 1854, a general act was passed [37] empowering "any two or more adjoining school districts in this State" to unite "by a two-thirds vote of the legal voters in each of said districts." A year later the act was amended [38] requiring the assent of only two-thirds of the legal voters of each of the said districts "present at any legal meeting thereof duly notified and holden for that purpose." For ten years the number of votes required for union fluctuated between a majority and two-thirds, but after 1865 the law permitted district unions by a majority vote of the districts' voters.

---

[35] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. CCCCLV, Session Laws of 1839.

[36] *Ibid.,* Chap. 220, Session Laws of 1845.

As has been noted, the decade, 1840 to 1850, may fairly be said to mark the high point in "district domination." From that time forward may be sensed, in legal enactments and school reports, a growing dissatisfaction with the results of the district organization. More and more, as time passed, these results cluttered up the debit side of the New Hampshire educational ledger. School committees and professional educators attacked the "district plan" with logic, invective, and sarcasm, but for forty years more it shaped the destinies of New Hampshire's public school system. Since, however, the recital of developments in the remaining years of the "district period" is concerned for the most part with somewhat timid legislative efforts to secure educational relief through resort to a growing state power, it may be well to examine at this point some representative results of the administration and support which the district organization secured.

It is not necessary to point out that all the differences which may be found between educational conditions in the "district period" and those of the present are not necessarily the result of differences in administrative organization. Numerous variable factors in the two periods are possible, probable, indeed certain causes of difference in the degree of educational attainment. To attribute to the "district plan" all of the evils in nineteenth century New Hampshire education, and to attribute to its absence all of the increasing present-day achievement would be unjust folly. However, one may properly attempt to estimate results which consistently accompany any possible causal factor, and seek to discover whether these results are inherent in the very nature of this possible cause. Approaching the problem in this spirit, one would seem to find certain rather well-defined phenomena which grew naturally out of the district plan of school administration and support.

---

[37] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 1537, Session Laws of 1854.

[38] *Ibid.*, Chap. 1679, Session Laws of 1855.

Two causes contributed to render the district organization an ever-increasing evil in New Hampshire education. The first was the removal from once prosperous districts of population and wealth. While the taxable wealth decreased, the cost per pupil increased. In such circumstances the district faced the necessity of an exorbitant tax rate to secure good schools, a shortened school year bought with insufficient funds, or a poor school for a longer term. There was choice among evils, only. The other general cause of difficulty was the existence of narrow and factional "localism," injecting community feuds into educational affairs, and finding expression in "district" fights and unwise "spite" dividing and subdividing. It is not permissible to give here the volumes of evidence which might be adduced. Illustrative of much of this evidence is an instance cited in the 1857 *Report* of the County Commissioner of Belknap County to the State Board where he says,

> . . . where all formerly were well accommodated in one district a while since, a certain strange-headed people went to work and succeeded in getting the territory cut up into three districts; and, as if to show what peculiar freaks men can take, they made the division, so that a part of the scholars in the easterly district have to pass directly by the schoolhouse door of the central district and go away some half or three-fourths of a mile to their school, while the southwestern district (if I get the locality right) is so weak, that they do not pretend to maintain a school only a short time in the summer.[39]

In 1852 the *State Report of the Board of Education* gives numerous references to damaging district subdivision. The Committee for the town of Dover in its report gives a typical observation on the matter. It says,

> No one can fail to notice the inequality and injustice of the present school system. One part of the town is (as it may be said), over-educated, while another part is almost deprived of the privileges of the common school. This is caused by dividing a town into school-districts.[40]

The County Commissioner for Grafton County reports in 1858 that,

---

[39] *New Hampshire State Board of Education, Annual Report 1857*, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 37.

[40] *Ibid.*, 1852, Appendix, p. 179.

> . . . the mania for small schools has led to an "infinite divisibility" of districts. It is a sad mistake many towns must be re-districted and the schools made larger before they will prosper.[41]

And in the same year the Commissioner for Hillsborough County reports,

> I found one district which had but a single scholar, several, which did not exceed four, and from twenty to twenty-five which numbered not over twelve. . . . During the past year a few districts in the county have been united, and, in every instance, with the most satisfactory results.[42]

In this year, 1858, six of the ten county commissioners stressed, in their reports, the necessity of uniting the too numerous districts into larger schools. An examination of the local and state reports for the succeeding years shows, however, no appreciable decrease in the number of districts, and the County Commissioner for Strafford County bitterly states in 1865 the general opinion of the professional educators of his time by noting "the attempt to illustrate the 'atomic theory' by dividing towns into many small districts." [43]

The agitation, sarcasm, and logic secured little relief in the matter. Tradition continued to maintain the old "district school" just as it had been for nearly a century, and it was not until the legislature, in 1885, abolished the "district plan" that there came any appreciable reduction in the number of school administrative units. The number of school districts for various years as reported in the state reports are given below.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR VARIOUS YEARS REPORTED IN STATE REPORTS

YEAR	NUMBER OF DISTRICTS
1852	2,284
1858	2,343
1865	2,299
1870	2,230
1875	2,118
1880	2,010
1885	1,965
1886	1,890
1889	267
1900	257
1926	252

---

[41] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1858, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 7.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[43] *Ibid.*, 1865, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 24.

Surely here is evidence that the legislation of July 15, 1854, permitting districts to unite for educational profit was almost totally ineffectual, and it remained for the compulsory act of 1885 to bring to New Hampshire education a more salutary administrative system.

The effect of this overdistricting was, of course, to increase expenses tremendously. Unnecessary houses must be maintained and teachers employed. Through all the local and state reports of the greater part of this "district period" runs this complaint. As a result of these small districts with inadequate funds, numerous evils appeared. Poor, unsanitary, and illy equipped schoolhouses was one of these evils.

It is not possible to tell exactly what was meant by the term, "number of schoolhouses unfit for their purposes." Under this head has been reported by the local school authorities to the state the following, by years:

NUMBER OF SCHOOLHOUSES UNFIT FOR THEIR PURPOSES, BY YEARS

YEAR	UNFIT SCHOOLHOUSES
1858	500
1865	563
1870	387
1875	388
1880	292
1885	242
1890	214
1895	126
1900	82
1905	48
1910	64

Regarding the condition of the schoolhouses, the reports for the district period burst into poetry, sarcasm, and invective. In 1852 the Secretary of the State Board of Education reports:[44]

> The condition of our school houses is beginning to attract attention. Till within a few years, there has not been a class of buildings in the State less inviting than this. The genius of architecture had descended on the folds for our sheep, and on the stables for our horses, but nine-tenths of the school houses of the State were where time and the elements had borne them. . . . A large majority of the school houses at the present time

---

[44] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1852, p. 45.

> are an opprobrium and disgrace to the community. . . . Many of them, though comparatively new, are not built after the most improved models, and are injured in their construction by violations of some of the plainest and most important principles of good architecture.

On July 5, 1849, the legislature had authorized,[45]

> That the treasurer of the State be instructed to procure a copy of Barnard's *School Architecture* for each town in the State, to be kept by the town clerk for the use of the town.

The 1852 *State Report* urges district committees to consult this before constructing houses, and in the State Report volume is also included a number of plans and specifications for school buildings. We may well suppose that conditions were not improved greatly, however, for the *State Report* of 1860 is replete with complaint of poor housing conditions in schools. The County Commissioner of Rockingham County in reporting his inspection of one town says,[46]

> My visit was made in November, but all the schools were closed for the year. The reason was evident on visiting the school houses. The town does not possess a single school house which reflects credit upon the enterprise or taste of its citizens. . . . The town is wealthy, but the people are indifferent.

The Commissioner for Carroll County reports [47] the same year that,

> There has been but little improvement in the condition of the school houses. A large majority of them are the same miserable old shanties, so graphically described by some of my predecessors. Every individual in the districts where these notoriously unfit houses are situated is well aware of the unfitness, and *generously* acknowledges it, and tells you that it is next to impossible to have a profitable school in an illy constructed, unventilated, uncomfortable house, yet takes not the proper measures to have the nuisance removed.

Five years later the County Commissioner of Coos County breaks forth in verse, saying,[48]

---

[45] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 905, Session Laws of 1849.

[46] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education*, 1860, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 44.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[48] *Ibid.*, 1865, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 55.

> There are too many shabby huts yet in our county, occupied by faithful teachers, and would be diligent students, which would well bear, and should wear in burning letters, the inscription of the Yankee wag,
>
> "God speed the day when every Yankee father,
> Forgetting beasts shall love his children rather,
> Nor educate his sons though white or sable,
> In buildings that libel sty or stable."

Surely data are not lacking to show that, in spite of all the good that may easily be found in New Hampshire schoolhouse conditions during a great part of the nineteenth century, thousands of her children through the years spent miserable and unhealthful hours in unsanitary and poor school buildings which stood as cross-roads monuments to the spirit of "local self-government." It would be unjust to assume that poor housing conditions would not have existed but for the "district plan" of administration and support, and yet it is not too much to say that, since this plan of organization increased the number of schoolhouses and decreased the average district tax fund, it rendered almost impossible the creation and maintenance of proper buildings. Moreover, lack of any central authority to establish and enforce architectural and sanitary standards gave room for exercise of the arbitrary prejudice and ignorance of local committees in creating housing conditions. Only with the abolishment of the "district," increase of funds per school, and exercise of a state-wide standardizing authority were conditions improved in a later period.

It has been noted that free textbooks did not come to New Hampshire schools until 1889, four years after the repeal of the "district plan." A reading of local and state reports previous to that time convinces one that lack of uniformity in textbooks, with resultant impossibility of properly classifying the schools, had been one chief cause of such poor educational conditions as had existed. Here was educational "localism" at its extreme. So long as school patrons were furnishing textbooks they largely exercised the "inherent right" to send their children to school with such books as the family happened to possess. True, the law gave to superintending school committees power to determine and prescribe textbooks, and patrons were enjoined to provide such prescribed books. But the frequent changes in the personnel of these committees brought anarchy into the textbook situation. Each new committee felt called upon, through the urgent logic of numerous book agents, to change books, and soon each district was overwhelmed by a motley array of texts which made high average educational attainment practically impossible. In 1852, the Secretary of the State Board of Education notes that,[49]

> Instructors often labor hard without any adequate results, because they are not able to make a proper classification of their Schools, on account of the variety of text books. . . . We have no right to expect much from the best teachers under such circumstances. . . . Committees should decide upon the text books to be used, and put a list of the same into the hands of each teacher, and require him to exclude all others from the school. And when a good degree of uniformity has been secured, newly elected committees should beware how they disturb it. Let them arm themselves against the solicitations of publishers and their agents.

The passing of time, and opportunity which it gave to committees to correct this fault in New Hampshire education does not seem to have brought relief, for eight years later, in 1860, the Secretary of the State Board again discusses[50] the subject of textbooks, saying,

> Incident to this system is the frequent change of text books, so liberally encouraged by publishers and agents. Changes should be sufficiently frequent to keep pace with the real improvements of science and of text books but when the changes, regulated by no principle, are left to the tender mercies of enterprising publishing houses, text books are shuffled in and out by the varying skill of agents so rapidly that the practice becomes an imposition, and, not infrequently, a cruel tax upon the community.
>
> It would seem as though our school districts had been divided up infinitesimally on purpose to meet this factitious demand for improved textbooks. . . . At present the cause of education in the State demands a decrease in the number of school districts, and a great reduction in the number of classes and text books in the schools.

It may be seen here that the Secretary of the State Board of Education, familiar as he was with the reports from all over the state, finds a causal relationship between the district system and lack of uniformity of textbooks. In 1870 the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, discussing the matter of textbooks in the *State Report* says,[51]

> A large proportion of those who send pupils to the common schools are comparatively poor, and make the transient, floating population of our

---

[49] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education*, 1852, p. 41.

[50] *Ibid.*, 1860, p. 21.

[51] *Ibid.*, 1870, p. 31.

> state. Many change their place of residence one or more times each year, and as their children attend schools in different towns or even in different districts in the same town, they are obliged to procure different text books in order to comply with the requirements of each school. . . . A child brought into New Hampshire from another state, in order to be prepared for any school, would have to be provided with a snug little library of text books, numbering a little over two hundred volumes.

If one may trust the reports of the local school committees, the textbook situation grew not better, but worse, as time passed. In a further attempt to bring some increased degree of uniformity, the legislature, on September 7, 1883, passed an act [52] which stipulated that committees might not change any series of texts more often than each five years, "unless the prices for which new books are stipulated to be sold after their introduction shall be increased by the publishers." And the same year an act became law [53] providing that,

> Any town or any district, at any lawful meeting, may raise money by taxation or otherwise for supplying the scholars in the common schools with suitable school books free of charge.

This permissive legislation seemed, as evidence shows, not to bring the desired relief, and on July 30, 1889, the compulsory "free textbooks" law [54] was passed charging that,

> The school committee of every city and town shall purchase, at the expense of such city or town, text books and other supplies used in the public schools. . . .

The uniformity of textbooks and the possibility of some degree of workable classification of school work were thus at last secured in New Hampshire through compulsory action of the state.

It is, of course, not possible to consider here all detailed features of the "district system" and its effects. One cannot, however, well pass to discussion of other phases of New Hampshire educational development without noting some of the more outstanding characteristics of the district administrative personnel—the Superintending and Prudential School Committees. It has been noted that these committees were brought into being in the New Hampshire schools by legislative act of 1827. Even before this time the districts had given into the hands of committees power to determine and administer school activities, both business and pedagogical. For a century, almost, the policies, procedures, and equipment of the state's common public schools were determined by these locally chosen groups.

---

[52] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 68, Session Laws of 1883.

[53] *Ibid.,* Chap. 46, Session Laws of 1883.

[54] *Ibid.,* Chap. 13, Session Laws of 1889.

To the Prudential Committee was delegated power to conduct the business affairs of the district, the most important duty being to "select and contract with the teachers for his district." To the Superintending Committee was given the duty of examining teachers, inspecting and supervising instruction, "direct and determine the class books," and "use their influence and best endeavors that the youth in the several districts attend the schools."

Those who would wish to learn the quality of the actual services which these committees performed in New Hampshire education can do no better than to sketch hurriedly through the existing state and local school reports. To say that no good ever came of the system would be extremely unjust and untrue. Thousands of able, devoted, and sacrificing men gave of their time and means in service on these committees, receiving as their reward only the satisfaction of rejoicing in the expanding lives of the little people whose interests they cherished and labored to further. But it is only fair to say that this virtue was inherent in the individual committeemen, and not in the system itself. As one reads in the reports the lament of friends of education during all those years, he finds amply sufficient data to convince him that the system was inherently faulty as a method of educational administration.

No better summarization of hundreds of expressed opinions can be found, perhaps, than that given by the County School Commissioner of Strafford County in 1858 in his report to the State Board. He says,[55]

> There is a fault in the operation of our school system, arising not so much from a deficiency in our school laws as from a want of care in the selection of suitable persons for Prudential Committees. They are chosen too frequently without regard to their qualifications or aptitude for their prescribed duties—simply because they may wish to introduce some friend to a school, regardless of the interests of the district. Often it happens that partizan measures are suffered to be introduced and men are elected

---

[55] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education,* 1858, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 18.

> totally unfit to discharge the simplest duties pertaining to their trust. But this is not all. Rotation in office is too much in practice; in political circles rotation may be advisable; but under our system of education, there is one gift, if worthily conferred, should not be subject to this unreasonable custom, for, as long as this is done, we may expect a want of perfect and systematic organization in our schools.

The same year the Commissioner for Belknap County observes [56] that,

> Prudential and Superintending Committees are sometimes chosen solely for political motives, without regard to qualifications; and in some instances, the blunders of the latter, at the examination of schools, afford no little merriment to the pupils, and cause much trouble to the teacher, in maintaining proper decorum.

To get some conception of the system one has but to imagine the non-existence of all present-day professional educators except classroom teachers, and in place of all present-day professionally trained superintendents, principals, and supervisors in our public school system imagine the services of committees of citizens elected by popular vote. Into this complex of professional ignorance inject the shortcomings of community politics and local animosities and one has something resembling the potentialities of the committee system of educational administration and supervision that prevailed in New Hampshire under the district plan of organization.

It should not be thought that the shortcomings of the system were unknown to friends of education at that time. The value of professional administration and supervision was recognized. In 1855 a law was passed [57] authorizing the authorities of Manchester to "Elect some suitable person to be superintendent of public instruction in said city." The law provided that any city might adopt the privilege for itself at any meeting lawfully called for that purpose.

In 1870 the state superintendent in his annual report [58] urged the employment of the provision of the law, General Statutes, Chapter 81, specifying that,

---

[56] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education,* 1858, County Commissioner's Reports, p. 72.

[57] *Laws of New Hampshire, Chap.* 1675, Session Laws of 1855.

[58] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education,* 1870, p. 30.

> Any town may adopt a by-law providing for the choice of any school committee of such number, chosen in such manner, for such terms, with such title and such powers relating to schools, as they may think proper.

Here the state was giving the local school units opportunity to escape from the evils of the bi-committee system. Not only this, but there was urged at the same time the utilization of a new law [59] which provided that,

> Any town, by a by-law, may provide for the election of a Superintendent of schools . . . vested with the powers . . . and duties of the school committee and of the prudential committee.

These instances are but representative of the efforts which friends of education were making to escape from the evils of non-professional administration and supervision in the schools of New Hampshire. Not only was there expressed a feeling that there should be a greater degree of centralized power in professional hands within each district, but, running through the reports, there is an expression of feeling that some type of organization should secure greater coördination between the individual schools. The County Commissioner for Sullivan County expresses this feeling in his 1865 report [60] to the state board, saying,

> No one can have given attention to the schools of the County, or State, without observing the fact that they have too little connection with each other; that, to a too great extent they maintain an isolated position, the management of each school being in separate hands.

And five years earlier the Secretary of the State Board of Education had stated in the annual report [61] the feeling of the County Commissioners that,

> All the educational institutions of the State, of whatever grade, should be made to feel and yield to the force of an attractive influence, common to them all, so that each, as it moves in its own proper orbit, shall be drawn kindly to every other. The fostering and protecting influence of the State, legitimately dispensed through the proper officials, it was believed would tend to bring the entire network of schools throughout the state into one harmonious system, and give them a power for enlightening and elevating the youth of the state, which they never could possess if left to shift for themselves.

[59] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education*, 1870, p. 146.
[60] *Ibid.*, 1865, p. 45.
[61] *Ibid.*, 1860, p. 13.

This was in 1860, and three score years were to pass before New Hampshire's public schools were truly to feel "the fostering and protective influence of the State, legitimately dispensed through the proper officials." But during all those sixty years, the friends of education never ceased their efforts. In the very face of the decentralizing movement, and as the "district system" was rising to its greatest power, these heralds of a better day in New Hampshire education were making strenuous efforts to secure graded schools in the large districts and villages. In 1840 an act was passed authorizing the division and grading of any school whenever the number of the pupils should equal fifty or more. Thus was launched a movement based upon a principle almost exactly opposite to that of the district system—the gathering of many children into a single school instead of scattering them among small, separate schools. Although it was not possible to secure action of a state-wide character, progress was made by securing special legislation enabling a few progressive communities to unite schools, money, and effort in the establishment of classified and more advanced schools.

As part of this movement toward centralization came some important legislation in 1846. On July 10, the legislature passed an act[62] establishing the office of Commissioner of Common Schools. The governor and council were authorized to appoint the commissioner who was to hold office for one year. The law stipulated that,

> It shall be the duty of the commissioner to spend at least twenty weeks in the different counties of the state, each year, for the purpose of promoting, by inquiries, addresses, and other means, the cause of education.

The law further provided that district superintending school committees were to report annually to the state commissioner upon the conditions of schools in their towns, and in turn, the commissioner was to "make to the General Court a report upon the common schools of the state, which shall comprise the substance of the returns of the several towns, and such information and suggestions as seem to him useful."

The second outstanding move toward centralization was a law[63] of July 3, 1846, which empowered any town to "raise, in addition to the amount by law required to be raised therein for the support of common schools, a sum, not exceeding five per cent of such amount, to be applied to the support of a teachers institute within the limits of the county in which said town is situated."

---

[62] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 316, Session Laws of 1846.

[63] *Ibid.*, Chap. 338, Session Laws of 1846.

Thus came teachers' institutes. It was recognition of the fact that there are some educational principles and techniques which may not be just "picked up," and that there were people in New Hampshire better able to inform teachers of proper methods than could a group of good citizens on a town's superintending school committee. It was a distinct legal move in the direction of teacher training and dependence upon distinctly professional equipment in the conducting of educational matters.

This law had "empowered" towns to raise funds for institutes. In 1851 it was amended[64] *to require* the towns to raise "a sum equal to three per cent of the amount required by law to be raised for the support of common schools" to be used for the support of institutes. Two years later this sum was reduced to two per cent of the school money, and in 1861 the institutes were abolished.[65] They had failed under the management of poorly and unprofessionally trained county commissioners, but their re-establishment later showed that the experience of the people with their schools had convinced them that there are educational techniques which must somehow be specially given and acquired if schools are to function in imparting the ideals of the State.

It is important to note that this period marked the beginning of the recording and preservation of somewhat trustworthy school records. A law of July 3, 1845,[66] had required the officers of each district to send to the Secretary of State of New Hampshire the reports which they had made to their town. The law of 1846[67] went farther and required that the superintending school committees send their reports to the secretary of state in April, and he in turn was to deliver to the state commissioner of common schools "a copy of the report presented by them to the town," and also other items, including amounts of school appropriations, the studies taught, textbooks used, methods of teaching employed, condition of the schoolhouses, and other matters asked for by the commissioner.

---

[64] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 1156, Session Laws of 1851.

[65] *Ibid.,* Chap. 2506, Session Laws of 1861.

[66] *Ibid.,* Chap. 226, Session Laws of 1845.

[67] *Ibid.,* Chap. 316, Session Laws of 1846.

Another act [68] provided that, "The Superintending School committee shall receive no compensation for their services until they shall have satisfied the selectmen that they have attended to the duties and made the reports, by law required of them," and in the same law it is commanded that, "It shall be the duty of every teacher of a public school to make, at the close thereof, a report to the superintending committee of the town, of the number of scholars, male and female, that have attended; the branches of learning taught, and the progress made. And no teacher shall be entitled to pay for his services until this provision has been complied with."

Impetus was given to the movement for preparation of school reports by a provision of a law in 1848 [69] which provided that the state treasurer was to distribute the Literary Fund each June "among the several towns and places in this State, according to the number of scholars of such towns and places, not less than four years of age, who shall by the report of the Superintending School committees of the several towns and places returned to the secretary of state for the year preceding, appear to have attended the district common schools. . . ." Teeth were put in this act by an amendment in 1851 [70] which provided that, "The Superintending School committee of any town neglecting to make a return of the schools of said town to the secretary of state agreeably to the provisions of this chapter, shall be responsible to said town for the amount of the literary fund forfeited through his negligence."

Thus was laid, in a series of laws, foundation for the preservation of the school records and educational accomplishments. Its importance for school organization and administration is almost obvious. Without it there can be no comparison of results of policies, no setting of standards, no state-wide system. The state reports of New Hampshire's educational activities and conditions from 1846 to the present time, imperfect and sometimes incomplete though they are, give the state's educational statesmen their best basis for fair comparison of the results of different administrative policies and practices.

In this epochal year, 1846, came, also, the first legal move of New Hampshire in promoting school attendance through regulation of child labor. This law [71] was not stringent in its provisions, but it is important as marking the establishment of a policy. It provided that,

---

[68] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 317, Session Laws of 1846.
[69] *Ibid.*, Chap. 738, Session Laws of 1848.
[70] *Ibid.*, Chap. 1102, Session Laws of 1851.

> No child under the age of fifteen years shall be employed to labor in any manufacturing establishment, unless such child shall have attended some public or private day school where instruction is given by a teacher qualified . . . at least three months of the twelve months next preceding.

The act provided that if the child were under twelve years of age, he must have attended school during six months of the preceding year. "It shall be the duty of the several school committees within this state to inform of all violations of this act," and, "the duty of the commissioner for common schools . . . to inquire into any violations of this act, and report the same to the attorney general, whose duty it shall be to prosecute for the same." A fine of fifty dollars for violation was to be imposed.

Two years later, in 1848, came the enactment of the state famous "Somersworth Act" [72] which was to have tremendous influence in shaping the course of public secondary school development in New Hampshire. It provided that

> Selectmen of the town of Somersworth shall annually . . . appoint a Superintending School committee for school district numbered three in said town, consisting of not less than five nor more than seven . . . invested with all the powers and perform all the duties in said district that Superintending School committees are authorized or required to perform in towns.
>
> There may be kept and maintained in said district one or more high schools, in which may be taught all the branches usually taught in English Grammar schools, and such additional branches as the Superintending committee may direct. . . .

The superintending committee was empowered to divide the scholars "into such divisions and classes . . . as they may consider judicious and shall direct what school each class or division shall attend." Full powers were given to build needed houses and secure necessary equipment, and the act was to go into effect upon its acceptance by the Somersworth district.

On December 19 of the same year, the legislature decreed [73] that the provisions of the Somersworth Act "are hereby extended and made applicable to all school districts which may adopt said act at legal meetings held for that purpose," and, by an additional law,[74] it was made possible that "when the number of scholars in any school district shall exceed one hundred, such district may vote to keep such high school or schools as the interests of education may require." An Act of 1856 [75] provided that any district might abandon the Somersworth plan of organization "at any legal meeting called for that purpose."

---

[71] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 318, Session Laws of 1846.

[72] *Ibid.*, Chap. 631, June Session Laws of 1848.

[73] *Ibid.*, Chap. 718, Session Laws of 1848.

The year 1850 marks the beginning of the only attempt that New Hampshire has ever made to utilize the county as a unit of school organization and administration. For reasons aside from the merits of the system itself the office of state commissioner of common schools was abolished, and, with the purpose of introducing a system of common school supervision that should reach every town and district in the state, a new act was passed [76] for the appointment of county school commissioners, who were to be appointed by the Governor and Council annually, and in their associated capacity were to be a board of education for the state. One commissioner resided in each county. Each commissioner was to make a yearly report to the secretary of the board (one of their own number) and he prepared the state school report. As a board of education they were to meet at the capital of the state on the third Wednesday in August. It was their duty "to recommend such books as may appear to them most suitable to be used in common schools, and such methods of instruction, modes of government and discipline to be pursued in said schools as may seem best adapted to promote their usefulness."

> It shall be the duty of the county commissioners to spend not less than one day in each town of his county each year, for the purpose of promoting by addresses, inquiries, and other means, the cause of common school education. . . . It shall also be the duty of each county commissioner to take charge of any teachers' institutes that may be held in his county.

The limitations of this study do not permit full consideration of the merits and demerits of this county commissioner system. One may sense some reasons for its failure as a method of educational administration and supervision as he reads in the 1857 report of the Secretary of the State Board that,

---

[74] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 729, Session Laws of 1848.

[75] *Ibid.,* Chap. 955, Session Laws of 1850.

[76] *Ibid.,* Chap. 1860, Session Laws of 1856.

> Seven years ago the office of County Commissioner of Common Schools in this State was constituted. During this period thirty-six different men have held this office, twelve of whom have been in office one year only, and seventeen only two years. These gentlemen have belonged to the professions as follows:—1 farmer, 2 editors, 5 physicians, 8 lawyers, 6 teachers, 14 clergymen. . . . All have been active in their usual vocations, and attended to this office as other pursuits have permitted. The whole annual compensation for the ten counties, exclusive of institute labor, has been only $1,200. The service performed for this salary has been, to spend not less than one day in each of the 228 towns of the State, at their own charges, in visiting schools, gathering educational statistics, and exciting an interest in the advancement of popular education.[77]

Comment seems unnecessary. It was a vague, timid, and in the end, unsuccessful attempt to get the benefits of a centralized state authority, and at the same time those of personal professional supervision in the schools. The system lasted for seventeen years until it was supplanted in 1867 by the establishment of the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

During the years from 1846 to 1867, numerous school laws were passed, but none of major importance. They were all in effort to correct details in the district system and the county commissioner method of supervision. Such matters as district boundaries, schoolhouse location, school records, school elections, and school taxes were changed in detail, but not altered in fundamental principle. The people of New Hampshire were trying to make decentralized control and support "work."

But the large movement was more and more in the direction of greater centralization. On July 6, 1867, an act was passed [78] creating the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and a State Board of Education made up of the Governor and his Council, with the State Superintendent as ex officio member. To this board was given,

> . . . general supervision and control of the educational interests of the state; shall prescribe the form of registers to be kept in the schools; and the form of blanks and inquiries for the returns to be made by the school committees; shall annually . . . lay before the General Court a report containing a printed abstract of said returns, and a detailed report of all the doings of the board with such observations upon the condition and efficiency of the system of popular education in this State, and such suggestions as to the best means of improving it as the experience and reflections of the Board may dictate.

[77] *Report of New Hampshire Board of Education*, 1857, p. 7.

[78] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. VI, Session Laws of 1867.

In the light of modern educational theory and practice, it is evident that the powers of this board were limited, and that they were given small scope in which to promote better practices. They could neither make nor enforce any rule or law, had no funds at their disposal, and could do little but advise. They had power to appoint the state superintendent, but he, in turn, was given small powers to do more than inspire and report. In addition to his clerical duties on reports, abstracts, and so forth, he was to,

> . . . visit, as often as his other duties will permit, different parts of the State, for the purpose of awakening and guiding public sentiment in relation of practical interests of education; shall collect in his office such school books, apparatus, maps and charts, as can be obtained without expense to the State.

It is evident, in the provisions of this law, that New Hampshire lawmakers were recognizing the necessity of help from some professional educational source, from someone who knew good school policies and practices, but they were afraid, as yet, to give this authority power to do much to remedy the conditions. It was, however, a distinct step in the direction of centralization, and from 1867 to the present time New Hampshire has had a State Department of Education with ever-increasing responsibilities and powers.

In this general movement toward a centralization of power in educational control came a revival of the teachers' institutes. On July 3, 1868, a bill became law,[79] making provision that,

> . . . there shall be held annually in each county, under the supervision of the state superintendent of public instruction, a teachers' institute.

The state superintendent "may appoint and give notice of a time and place for the meeting of such institute, and make suitable arrangements therefor." He was also to determine the length of the meetings "which in no instance shall be less than eight days," and $3,000 was appropriated per year for lectures, teachers, and other expenses of the sessions. This was to be divided, not more than $300 to go to any one county per year.

On June 28, 1867, an addition was made to the state-wide school fund by an act [80] in which the governor and council were empowered to sell the state public lands,

[79] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. XIX, Session Laws of 1868.
[80] *Ibid.,* Chap. XLII, Session Laws of 1867.

> together, or in parcels, as may be by him deemed most advantageous to the state, the proceeds of such sale or sales to be placed in the State Treasury and constitute a part of the literary fund to be divided among the several cities and towns, and by them applied to the maintenance of common schools, or to other purposes of education.

This was a further move in the direction of centralization of school support and control, since the state dictated terms under which the towns and districts might share in the distribution of this fund.

The next year, 1868,[81] a further provision was made that "the proceeds of the sale of the state lands . . . shall be, and the same hereby are, set apart as a school fund. The annual income of the said fund shall be applied to the purposes of common school education . . ." Thus was provided a permanent source of state aid and control of education in New Hampshire, and funds that could be spent only on terms dictated by a state-wide authority.

And then, on July 2, 1870, the towns and districts of the state, through their legislature, surrendered into the hands of a state-wide authority the task of deciding the proper equipment for a school teacher when a law was passed [82] establishing a state normal school at Plymouth "for the better training of teachers for the common schools of New Hampshire."

It was a long step toward the establishment of state-wide school standards, but the narrowness of vision which so guided educational policy may be seen in the provision that,

> . . . said normal school shall be established and maintained without expense to the state, except the necessary expenses of the trustees, which shall not exceed the sum of three hundred dollars.

One- and two-year courses were provided for and the law specified that,

> The certificate of graduation from the lower course shall have the effect of license to teach in the common schools of the state for three years from the date thereof, and certificates of graduation from the higher course shall have the effect of licenses to teach in such schools for five years from the date thereof.

From that time to the present, the normal schools (the second being established at Keene in 1909) have been factors of increasing importance in raising educational standards in the common schools of the state. Long ago the idea that the normal school could train teachers for the schools of the state with no expense to that state was abandoned, and the last fifty years of New Hampshire's educational history shows no policy more firmly established than that of the acceptance of the state normal schools as a necessary part of a great and serviceable system of public education.

---

[81] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. XXI, Session Laws of 1868.

[82] *Ibid.*, Chap. VI, Session Laws of 1870.

With the establishment of a teacher-training institution, it appeared not so necessary to maintain institutes, and by an act of July 7, 1874, they were abolished.[83] In the same act the State Department of Education was reorganized, the governor and council becoming a State Board of Education, and without the state superintendent as a member the board was to "appoint a superintendent of public instruction, who shall hold his office for the term of two years," and shall have general supervision and control of the educational interests of the state. This law gave no real powers additional to those formerly held by the board and superintendent, although it was more in line with present-day policy of limiting a state board of education to laymen in professional education. But New Hampshire "localism" was not yet ready to part with any large powers. It recognized a great principle, but was not yet willing to surrender to its application.

Even so, there are limits to the power of "localism." The grinding wheels of social evolution eventually overwhelm it. On July 2, 1870, sixty-five years after the passage of the famous "Districting Law" of 1805, the legislature of New Hampshire formally admitted that the district system, worthy as it had once been, had failed to meet the educational needs of a developing and complex society. A law[84] was passed providing that,

> Any town may at any time abolish the school districts therein, and shall thereupon forthwith take possession of all the school houses, lands, apparatus and other property owned and used for school purposes, which such districts might lawfully sell or convey.

The law then stipulated that the town was to "be considered as one district, and shall have all the powers and liabilities of the same."

---

[83] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. XLIII, Session Laws of 1874.

[84] *Ibid.*, Chap. VIII, Session Laws of 1870.

> Such towns shall, at their annual town meeting in March, elect a board of education, consisting of not less than three persons, who shall have and exercise all the powers and duties of superintending and prudential committees of towns.

This legislation, permitting towns to abandon the district system, was the beginning of the rapid end of district domination in educational administration and support in New Hampshire common public schools. There came a slight reaction back toward the dying plan in 1874, when a law was passed [85] enabling any town which had abolished the district system under the act of 1870 to reëstablish the original districts by two-thirds vote at any time within two years from the passage of the act. This reaction was only temporary, however. The district system could not meet the insistent needs of the times, its usefulness had long since passed. The spirit of "localism," the New England tradition of community control, and ever-present social inertia stemmed the tide for ten years longer, but on August 13, 1885, the legislature brought an end to that which had its beginning as an educational necessity, but had degenerated into an educational farce by commanding [86] that,

> The division of towns into school districts heretofore existing is hereby abolished, and each town shall hereafter constitute a single district for school purposes; provided, however, that districts organized under special acts of the legislature may retain their present organization.

As in the permissive act of 1870, these town districts were to elect a school board of three members to serve three years, one to retire each year. These boards were ordered to,

> . . . provide schools within the limits of said town, at such places and times as in their judgment shall best subserve the interests of education, and as shall give all the scholars of the town as nearly equal advantages as may be practicable, and said school board may use a portion of the school money, not exceeding twenty-five per cent thereof, for the purpose of conveying scholars to and from such schools.

The blow to tradition and "localism" was eased somewhat by a provision which read that, "Any town, after five years from the time this act goes into effect, may by majority vote of all the voters of the district re-establish the district system in such town. . . ."

---

[85] *Laws of New Hampshire*, 1874, p. 311.

[86] *Ibid.*, Chap. 43, Session Laws of 1885.

All the forces of educational conservatism fought the centralizing movement and looked to the time when all might vote themselves back into their "ancient local rights." Their cause, however, was a lost one, and when the Revised Statutes went into effect on January 1, 1892, they contained a provision which prohibited the towns from returning to the district system. Thus was removed from New Hampshire education the last legal vestige of the school district as an organization for the support and administration of the public schools, except in a few special cases operating under legislative grant.

In concluding consideration of the district plan of administration and support of public schools in New Hampshire, it should, then, be pointed out that it represented a phase in a development, and that, fundamentally correct as it was for a certain time and a certain condition, it proved not to be an effective administrative instrument with which to meet urgent and growing problems in an evolving and increasingly complex society. It rested upon the principle that the education of the children of a local community is the concern of no one outside of that community, and likewise not his obligation. It practiced the theory that there is no such thing as professional techniques and special abilities and knowledges in the field of education; that there is and can be no such thing as some degree of expertness in conducting an educational system and its procedures beyond that of the common knowledge of any good and reliable citizen who may be elected as a school committeeman by his neighbors to decide school policies and prescribe and evaluate school practices.

The district system, as it finally developed, denied that people can learn, by study and experience, how to do a job better than can an average jack-of-all-trades. And in spite of their tradition, their love of "local self-government," and their trust in the "average man," the hardheaded and thoughtful Yankees of New Hampshire knew in the end that this is not true.

CHAPTER VI

RISE OF THE SUPERVISORY UNION AND INCREASE OF STATE INFLUENCE

In the preceding chapter was attempted an evaluation of the "district system" of administration and support of public education in New Hampshire. It was noted that it was a natural outgrowth of transitory social and economic forces, and that, with their passing, it more and more failed to function fruitfully as an instrument of educational administration. Its abandonment, like its inauguration, grew out of definite social forces and conditions and the ensuing efforts to find and establish an efficient type of organization, and the results of that search were no less surely a natural outgrowth of social forces and conditions. The trend in administrative practice which followed the passing of the district organization did not just "happen." It was *caused*. One may follow better the development of these administrative efforts if he reviews hurriedly the causal background, which gave them being.

It has been noted that at the beginning of the district system, and for some time after, there were no large cities in New Hampshire, no great factories, no concentration of people or property. The towns were fairly equal in numbers of grown-ups, of children, and in taxable wealth. The population in most of these towns was such that they could divide into districts and have an immediately local school in each district, well provided with pupils and measured by standards of that time, with ample tax funds for support. Each district was easily sufficient unto itself and had little need of financial or administrative assistance.

It was pointed out, also, in a previous chapter[1] that New Hampshire's rural population dwindled under the influence of the westward movement and the Industrial Revolution. The 1920 census shows 113 of the 235 towns in New Hampshire with less population than they had a century before. The movement had been under way for years, and hundreds of district schoolhouses which had been once filled with children came to have from two or three to a dozen pupils. Moreover, the wealth began to concentrate in the cities. Hundreds of the rural districts were reduced to poverty. They faced the necessity of levying exorbitant school taxes or attempting the maintenance of the local school with insufficient funds. To make matters worse, numerous localities had lost practically all of their capable people, and social degeneracy had resulted. There was no vision or leadership, and many of New Hampshire's children were growing up to ignorance and some degree of viciousness.

---

[1] See Chap. III.

Educationally, two things were needed in these unfortunate localities—more school money, and pedagogical vision and skill. They had neither, nor power in themselves to get them. If they were ever to have them they must be brought in from without. The only solution was some arrangement by which the prosperous regions should contribute assisting funds that these deficit places might maintain schools, and also importation of educational leadership and administrative guidance in the form of professional school supervisors and administrators. The district system had not done this, and in its very nature probably could not. New Hampshire turned to other administrative methods.

In tracing in this chapter the development of administrative policy, structure, and practice, which supersede the district in the period from 1885 to 1919, it is felt to be unnecessary to include discussion of the effects of these practices. As part of the succeeding chapter, a summarization is given of conditions which culminated in the educational legislation of 1919. These conditions resulted because of, or in spite of, the educational policies and practices in the period previous to 1919. It is felt that there will be better understanding of the educational needs and social motives which prompted and shaped the Act of 1919, if these conditions are discussed in immediate connection with the consideration of the law and its provisions. To include them here, therefore, would but repeat them. This chapter will attempt, then, to trace only the legal evolution of the increasingly centralized organization for educational administration and support, which was transitional from the district system to that which was provided in the 1919 law.

The nature of this study prohibits consideration of many of the details in this development. There can be noted only the outstanding and fundamentally determining features which gave character to the movement. In general, it may be said of the period from 1885 to 1919 that it was one in which the state, through more insistent and stringent legislation, ever-increasing state appropriations for the assistance of economically unfortunate communities, and the spending of these funds for better equipment, professionally trained teachers, and a system of professional school administration and supervision, sought to overcome the evils which had grown up under the district system and which had resulted from wealth and population movements of the nineteenth century. In greater and greater measure during this period, the ancient tradition of the right of the local community to decide all school policy and practice was ignored. More and more in the matter of school funds, child labor and school attendance, high schools, illiteracy, teacher certification and training, school health and sanitation, and supervision of educational efforts and administration of school work, the state reached out into the local town districts and insisted upon changed policies and techniques. In the end it was found not possible to secure all the desired results through the legal organization and type of administrative machinery which was adopted with the abandonment of the district plan, and a rather sweeping administrative reorganization was necessary in 1919. Appreciable progress was made, however, and the forces of education came up to the 1919 legislature with a very definite and defensible program—the result of years of unceasing effort to give New Hampshire a unified system of education with an effective fiscal system.

A distinct weakness of the old local system had been its failure to provide for professionally trained teachers. Up to the time of the establishment of the normal school in 1870, no provision had been made to provide public training for the teachers of the public schools other than that given in the institutes. The law from time to time had required certain qualifications, but the local committees had been left with power to examine prospective teachers and determine whether the legal demands were met. This practically left the state with no teacher training and no professional standards. Superintending committees certified as they pleased, and prudential committees employed such teachers as they desired.

The establishment of the state normal school has been noted in the preceding chapter. Especially was it pointed out that the state expected the school to support itself by tuition fees, assisted by no state funds. This policy, however, was soon abandoned, and state appropriations were increased over and over in a campaign to rid the schools of the state of the non-professionally trained teacher. In 1871, $5,000 was appropriated [2] to enlarge the Normal buildings. In 1872 a further appropriation [3] of $8,000 was made, and the act stipulated that,

> . . . work of instruction in the said Normal school shall be confined to such branches of study as are really needful to prepare the pupils for teaching in the public schools of the state. . . .

Thus was frustrated any attempt to convert the new institution to ends other than teacher training. Still adhering to this policy, the state appropriated $5,000 the next year [4] for improvements and "teachers' salaries now due," and in 1874 the sum was repeated [5] for repairs, apparatus, and other expense. In 1875 an act provided [6] that,

> . . . tuition and graduation in the State Normal School shall be free to all those completing either and both of its prescribed courses of study, upon condition they shall, in consideration thereof, agree to teach in the schools of this state for a period equal to the time of said course or courses so completed.

Each succeeding legislature provided funds for the school, and finally, in 1889, $60,000 was provided [7] for the "purpose of erecting new school buildings and dormitories" at the Plymouth Normal School. In 1893, $10,000 was set as annual funds for the school, and the determination of the state to have trained teachers was shown by the establishment of a second normal school at Keene in 1909. Later consideration of the Law of 1919 will show that the state has not since faltered in its efforts to provide a well-trained teacher for every schoolroom in every district, urban or rural.

With this campaign for teacher training came one for higher standards in teacher certification. The act establishing the Normal school had provided for certification of its graduates. The next year a law was passed [8] providing that "at each teachers' institute now required by law to be holden annually . . . there shall be holden, under the direction of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the principal and supervisor of the Normal School, an examination . . . in either or both courses of study established in the Normal School." All persons passing such examinations satisfactorily were to be certified as qualified teachers on an equality with the normal graduates. Minor changes were made in certification requirements from time to time, but local committees were left with power to examine and certify teachers equal to that of the state authorities. In 1895 an act [9] relating to certificates issued by the state superintendent provided that,

---

[2] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. XV, Session Laws of 1871.

[3] *Ibid.,* Chap. V, Session Laws of 1872.

[4] *Ibid.,* Chap. LXVIII, Session Laws of 1873.

[5] *Ibid.,* Chap. CXVI, Session Laws of 1874.

[6] *Ibid.,* Chap. XXVI, Session Laws of 1875.

[7] *Ibid.,* Chap. 110, Session Laws of 1889.

> The certificates issued under the provisions of this act may be accepted by school committees in lieu of the personal examination required by sec. 6, chap. 92, of the Public Statutes.

Four years later the state power became more insistent and a provision [10] was added changing the "may be accepted" to "shall be accepted by school committees." In 1911, however, Chapter 92 of the Public Statutes was amended to read

> The school boards shall select and hire suitable and competent teachers . . .

and dropped the words, "holding certificates as provided by law."

Some progress was thus made in raising teacher qualifications in the period 1885-1919, but teacher certification remained one of the greatest powers of educational "localism" and a shortcoming which was not removed until 1919.

It has been noted that four years after the establishment of the Normal school in 1870, the institutes had been abolished. The passing of time showed, however, that the functions of the two were different. In 1883 the state superintendent gave as his opinion that,

> Every year there should be an institute in each county intelligently and judiciously conducted, through which the faculty of our Normal School and other able and experienced educators could bring their instruction to

---

[8] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. XXI, Session Laws of 1871.

[9] *Ibid.*, Chap. 49, Session Laws of 1895.

[10] *Ibid.*, Chap. 12, Session Laws of 1899.

bear upon the great body of our teachers, scattered through the different counties.

Accordingly a law was passed[11] making it the duty of the state superintendent to "organize, superintend and hold at least one teachers' institute each year in each county," and,

> . . . for the purpose of defraying the necessary expenses of such institutes, the state treasurer is hereby authorized to invest, as a permanent institute fund the proceeds of the sale of the state lands . . .

This, then, was another form of teacher training, under state direction and supported by a permanent state fund. To make it more effective an act[12] was passed in 1885 stipulating that,

> The time, not exceeding 3 days in any one term, or 5 days in one year actually spent by a teacher . . . upon a teachers institute . . . shall be considered time lawfully expended by such teacher in the service of the district. . . . And it shall be the duty of the school committees and boards of education to allow teachers to close their schools for such attendance.

In 1909 the law[13] was changed to provide for but "one day in each term," but the institutes have remained as one of the strong forces making for state-wide standards in the schools of New Hampshire.

In further attempt to increase the morale of the teaching force of the state, a teachers' pension law[14] was enacted in 1915, and was in successful operation for two years. The law was then declared unconstitutional and all pension payments were stopped. The same year an act became law[15] establishing an employment bureau in the office of the state superintendent where teachers might register and to which school boards might apply to secure desirable and competent teachers.

Surely this is a long march from the days when a Prudential Committee hired from out of the countryside such teachers as fortuity sent to his door.

The abandonment of the district plan had helped the educational situation in New Hampshire by decreasing the number of schools, increasing funds per school, and making classification and grading possible. But one paramount evil remained—unprofessional supervision. True, special legislative acts had long since given the more important places power to employ professionally trained superintendents who had been given the former powers and duties of the superintending committees, but in the rural towns the supervision was yet done entirely by lay committees. It was becoming more and more apparent, however, that the service which these committees of citizens could give in supervision of the techniques and practices of schools was largely fruitless. Accordingly, a law was enacted[16] in 1893 empowering "Somersworth districts" to elect a local superintendent of schools "who shall hold office for such time, be vested with such of the powers and charged with such of the duties of the school board as they may provide."

---

[11] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 73, Session Laws of 1883.
[12] *Ibid.*, Chap. 84, Session Laws of 1885.
[13] *Ibid.*, Chap. 28, Session Laws of 1909.
[14] *Ibid.*, Chap. 165, Session Laws of 1915.
[15] *Ibid.*, Chap. 156, Session Laws of 1915.

The state was at last actively on the way to professional supervision.

And then, in 1899 came the introduction of a new instrument in educational administration and support of New Hampshire public schools—the Supervisory Union, or District. This administrative tool, armed with ever-increasing powers and resources, was to become the instrument for educational resuscitation and salvation from many of the ills which had grown through the long period of the local district. The introductory law[17] of 1899 provided that,

> Two or more towns or special districts, or their school boards when duly authorized by their respective districts, may, by vote of each form a supervisory district for the purpose of employing a superintendent of the public schools therein, who shall perform in each town the duties prescribed by law and by the regulations of the school board, giving there to his entire time.

The school boards of the uniting districts were to "be the agent of each district therein represented," and

> . . . it shall elect a superintendent for such supervisory district, determine the character and value of his services, and apportion the same among the several districts, certifying such apportionment to their respective treasurers.

But this was not all. Not only did the act provide for professional supervision and supervisor, but,

---

[16] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 171, Session Laws of 1893.

[17] *Ibid.,* Chap. 77, Session Laws of 1899.

> Any town or special district whose equalized valuation does not exceed two million dollars which shall unite with one or more districts to form a supervisory district which shall employ as superintendent, at an annual salary, a person holding a permanent state teachers certificate and shall certify through its chairman and secretary such facts to the state treasurer, shall be entitled to one-half its apportioned share of said salary.

Thus came one more step in New Hampshire's rather tardy acceptance of the principles that professional school workers can supervise and administer schools better than can laymen, and that it was the duty of the richer and more fortunate portions of the state to assist, through state funds, in securing educational opportunity to the children of the poorer districts. State equalization and professional supervision had become part of the state's educational weapon.

It was provided that "supervisory districts under this act shall employ not fewer than twenty or more than sixty teachers," and the "right of local self-government" to maintain schools for such minimum time as local judgment dictated was overwhelmed in the law's mandate that, "every school district in the state shall maintain its schools at least twenty weeks during every school year."

A beginning appropriation of $25,000 annually was made, one-fourth to assist in paying salaries of supervisory district superintendents and the remainder to be apportioned,

> . . . to all the towns of the state in which the equalized valuation is less than $3,000 for each child of the average attendance in the public schools of such towns during the school year next preceding.

Any town not reporting to the state superintendent according to law or not maintaining twenty weeks of school per year was not to share in this or the Literary Fund.

On February 20, 1901, this act was amended [18] by striking out the provision that the equalized valuation of a district should not exceed two million dollars in order to qualify such district to share in state aid, and all districts were given state funds to pay one-half of a superintendent's salary. A law was passed in the same year [19] empowering towns to withdraw from a supervisory district "at any annual school district meeting, by vote." In 1905 an amendment [20] stipulated that if the supervisory district were of less than three towns or special districts it "shall employ not fewer than twenty nor more than sixty teachers," and in 1907 ten thousand dollars was appropriated [21] from the state treasury for state aid in addition to the previous $25,000 of the 1899 Act.

---

[18] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 18, Session Laws of 1901.

[19] *Ibid.,* Chap. 81, Session Laws of 1901.

[20] *Ibid.,* Chap. 115, Session Laws of 1905.

State equalization took a new form in 1909. A law [22] provided that state funds should be apportioned to towns according to equalized tax valuation. Where the valuation was $2,000 to $3,000 per pupil, $1.75 was to be given per school week for every twenty-five pupils in average attendance the preceding year; $3,000 to $4,000 was to receive $1.50; $4,000 to $5,000, $1.25 in state aid; and in districts having over $5,000 valuation, $1 was to be paid. There was a provision, also, that,

> When any district shall employ graduates of a New Hampshire normal school, or of any normal school in another state of equivalent grade, or persons holding a permanent New Hampshire state teachers' certificate, it shall receive a further sum of two dollars per week for every teacher so employed.

Eighty thousand dollars was appropriated from the state treasury, and in case this did not meet all demands for state aid the richest districts were to be left out of the apportionment. The state put administrative teeth in the whole measure by stipulating that,

> All money appropriated by this act shall be expended under the supervision of the governor and council.

State funds, through state-wide taxation, were coming to the aid of local need, but state administration was to insist upon its wise expenditure. New Hampshire had discovered that the loss of the "local right" to conduct schools poorly was not such an unhappy experience, and in the very next legislature increased the appropriation for state aid [23] from $80,000 to $115,000 per year. At the same time the state superintendent's salary was increased to $3,000 per annum,[24] showing that the services of a state-wide administrator were coming to be valued by the state.

One should not pass by this series of legislative acts without noting that the principle which was established by the Act of 1909 was fundamentally different from that principle of state or national aid which "matches" local appropriations with an equal sum from the wider administrative and tax unit. The latter principle is that "To him that hath shall be given." Such a principle would have been fatal in New Hampshire. Aid from without was needed in the communities in inverse ratio to their ability to provide for themselves. The poorer they were the more they needed outside help. This principle was contained in the 1909 Law, and has been the effective basis of all state aid since that time.

---

[21] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 115, Session Laws of 1907.

[22] *Ibid.,* Chap. 158, Session Laws of 1909.

[23] *Ibid.,* Chap. 174, Session Laws of 1911.

[24] *Ibid.,* Chap. 186, Session Laws of 1911.

In 1913 the legislature reduced very slightly the apportionment for state aid,[25] but this was more in the nature of an adjustment. The principle of state equalization, financial aid, and professional supervision came into the legislature of 1919 as an accepted and firmly established policy as foundation for the outstanding school law of that year, and the motive behind that legislation was not desire to change this policy, but the wish to provide more effective administrative machinery that this policy might have even greater fruition in educational practice.

During this time from 1885 to 1919 came a rather phenomenal growth in the public high schools of the state. It has been heretofore noted that secondary education in New Hampshire had passed into the hands of the academies and private schools, and, although a public high school had been established at Portsmouth as early as 1830, it was not until the late years of the nineteenth century, and under the impetus of state aid and interest, that the public high school system really developed.

The "Somersworth Act" of 1848 had launched a workable provision for establishment of high schools. It had provided that a district might vote to establish a high school under certain conditions. Little legislation of importance came again until 1874 when it was provided [26] that,

> Any town or school district in this state is authorized and empowered to conclude such business arrangements . . . with the trustees of any academy, seminary or other literary institution situated within the lines of the town, as said district or town may approve by a two-thirds vote of the legal voters present and voting at any legal meeting . . . , and the school money of said town or district may be used to carry out such contract. . . .

---

[25] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 182, Session Laws of 1913.

[26] *Ibid.,* Chap. XXXI, Session Laws of 1874.

This opened the way for districts to contract with private schools for secondary school services. This was not feasible in many cases, and in 1881 it was made possible[27] that,

> Any town, by majority vote in town meeting, or any school district having not less than one hundred children between six and sixteen years of age therein, by vote of two-thirds of the legal voters of said district at a legal meeting, may determine to establish a high school, and shall thereby be constituted a high school district; and no high school district so established shall thereafter be discontinued except by a vote of two-thirds of the legal voters of said district.

Minor regulative measures were passed from time to time regarding high schools. They merely changed details. It was not until 1901 that the state took steps to give secondary education a real place in the public school system of New Hampshire. A law was passed[28] specifying that,

> Any town not maintaining a high school or school of corresponding grade shall pay tuition of any child who with parents or guardian resides in said town and who attends a high school or academy in the same or another town. . . .

Five thousand dollars was appropriated from the state treasury which was to be distributed among the towns to aid in paying this tuition, the sum to be prorated according to the need as shown by school tax rate. The same act defined a "high school" or "academy" as meant by the act as,

> . . . a school having at least one four years' course properly equipped and teaching such subjects as are required for admission to college, technical school and normal school, such high school or academy to be approved by the state superintendent of public instruction as complying with the requirements of this section.

This act was amended by the next legislature,[29] providing a limit to amount of tuition to be paid in any one year, enabling the state superintendent to approve parts of a school's work, and making it possible for districts to contract with academies through approval of the state superintendent, in which case "said academy shall be deemed a high school maintained by such district."

---

[27] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 23, Session Laws of 1881.

[28] *Ibid.*, Chap. 96, Session Laws of 1901.

[29] *Ibid.*, Chap. 118, Session Laws of 1903.

Two years later the state put a strong hand on the high school situation by specifying[30] that,

> No high school established by a vote of the town shall be discontinued, or the location thereof be changed, except by the superior court, on petition of the school board of the town district in which it is located, after such notice as the court may order, if it shall appear that the educational interests of the town district require such discontinuance or change.

Here was a distinct move in the direction of centralization. For nearly three hundred years New Hampshire school boards had been receiving petitions, but at last these district school boards were put in the position of petitioning to some higher authority. The same year the state insisted that,

> It shall be the duty of any town in which there is a high school established by vote of the town, to raise and appropriate each year sufficient money to properly maintain such school.[31]

The state aid for high school tuition was increased from $5,000 per year to $8,000,[32] and the general high school law amended to make it possible for districts to contract, not only with private schools within the district's bounds, but anywhere in the state.[33]

In 1917 attempt was made to make some degree of high school opportunity the attainable right of every child in the state when there was passed an act[34] which stipulated that,

> It shall be the duty of school boards in districts in which there is no high school to provide for the further instruction of pupils for a period not exceeding two school years for those who have completed the course of study prescribed for the elementary schools whenever such pupils or their parents or guardians desire such instruction.

This did not, however, deprive children of such rights as were theirs under the free high school tuition laws as explained above.

In general, it may be said that in this problem of secondary education, as in other phases of its educational development, the state of New Hampshire found that progress came only when resort was had to a system of state-wide support and state inspection and approval. Local conceptions of the problem were so inadequate and the distribution of wealth such that secondary education would have remained forever a stranger to the children of some localities of the state. It remained for the Law of 1919 to create administrative machinery which would render fertile the principle which had been accepted—that it is the right of every New Hampshire child to have access to a publicly supported high school.

---

[30] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 20, Session Laws of 1905.
[31] *Ibid.*, Chap. 72, Session Laws of 1905.
[32] *Ibid.*, Chap. 89, Session Laws of 1905.
[33] *Ibid.*, Chap. 90, Session Laws of 1905.
[34] *Ibid.*, Chap. 24, Session Laws of 1917.

In no place was shown more the transfer from local to greater state control in education in this period, 1885-1919, than in the matter of school attendance. It has been noted in the preceding chapter that in 1827 the law had enjoined superintending committees "to use their influence and best endeavors that the youth in the several districts attend the schools," and that, in 1846 had come the first child labor act with school attendance provisions. Following this, nothing was done until 1868 when the law was made to declare [35] that,

> School committees may make such rules and regulations respecting the attendance of the public schools in their respective towns as, in their opinion, may be necessary.

There is shown here no insistence on the part of the state that children be made to attend school. All is left to local initiative. In 1871, however, a law was passed [36] providing that,

> . . . every parent, guardian, master, or other person having the custody, control, or charge of any child between the ages of eight and fourteen years, residing in any school district in which a public school is annually taught for the period of twelve weeks or more within two miles by the nearest traveled road from his residence shall cause such child to attend such public school for twelve weeks at least in every year . . . six weeks at least of which attendance shall be consecutive, unless such child shall be excused from such attendance by the school committee of the town, or the board of education. . . .

Instruction in private school or at home in proper branches might serve as a basis for excuse, as would mental and physical disability. Violation of this act was punishable by a ten-dollar fine, and twenty dollars for second and further offenses. In 1874 an act [37] to assist in securing attendance provided that selectmen and assessors should in April "make an enumeration of the children of each sex, between the ages of four and seventeen."

---

[35] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. IX, Session Laws of 1868.

[36] *Ibid.,* Chap. II, Session Laws of 1871.

[37] *Ibid.,* Chap. LII, Session Laws of 1874.

This was followed by a law [38] in 1881 authorizing superintending committees to appoint truant officers who were to compel attendance at school according to the law. In 1895 the law was amended [39] to require the truant officers to take the school census. The same year it was provided [40] that no certificate of attendance upon a private school would be accepted unless the school "shall have previously been approved by the school board of the district," and in 1899 a new act [41] stipulated that employment certificates might be granted to children "who are graduates of a regularly graded grammar school, approved by the state superintendent of public instruction, or who have an education equal to that of such graduates." Chapter 70 of the 1895 laws made provision that district truant officers might visit, "when authorized and required by vote of the school board," manufacturing and mercantile establishments thought to be employing children unlawfully. In 1899 an enactment [42] also provided that school boards were to appoint and pay truant officers who,

> . . . under the direction of the school board, enforce the laws and regulations relating to truants and children between the ages of 8 and 16 years not attending school.

Through this series of laws the state had increased its insistence that children must attend the schools, but it was not until 1901 [43] that there came child labor legislation with teeth in it. This act is the basis of all child labor legislation in New Hampshire since that time, and provides that,

> No child under the age of twelve years shall be employed in any manufacturing establishment. No child under the age of fourteen years shall be employed in any manufacturing establishment, nor in any mechanical, mercantile, or other employment during the time in which the public schools are in session in the district in which he resides. . . .
>
> No child under the age of sixteen years shall be employed as aforesaid during the time in which the public schools are in session in the district in which he resides without first presenting a certificate from the superintendent of schools, or, if there is no superintendent of schools, some person authorized by the school board, that such child can read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language. . . .

---

[38] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 42, Session Laws of 1881.

[39] *Ibid.*, Chap. 46, Session Laws of 1895.

[40] *Ibid.*, Chap. 62, Session Laws of 1895.

[41] *Ibid.*, Chap. 84, Session Laws of 1899.

[42] *Ibid.*, Chap. 70, Session Laws of 1899.

[43] *Ibid.*, Chap. 62, Session Laws of 1901.

> No minor shall be employed . . . who cannot read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language, while a free public evening school is maintained in the district in which he resides, unless he is a regular attendant at such evening school or at a day school. . . .

Provision was made for enforcement of this act by fine, and also for exceptions in enforcement in justifiable cases. And, once more ignoring the "ancient rights" of local school authorities, the legislature finally provided that,

> The State Superintendent of public instruction shall have authority to enforce the laws relating to attendance at school and the employment of minors, and, for this purpose he shall be vested with the powers given by law to truant officers. . . .

Two years later the compulsory attendance provision of the state was made to include, not only children between eight and fourteen years, but also any

> . . . child under the age of sixteen years who cannot read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language.[44]

The state power was strengthened by an enactment [45] of 1911 giving the state superintendent power to "make such other order or orders with respect to the attendance of such child at school as in his judgment the circumstances require." And in the same year the child labor powers of the state were appreciably strengthened by an amendment [46] which provided, not for ability "to read at sight" simple English sentences as an excuse for non-school attendance of sixteen-year-olds, but for ability to "read understandingly." Also, the superintendent of public instruction was empowered to appoint not exceeding three state inspectors to enforce the child labor laws, and $6,500 was appropriated for expenses of enforcement. The governor and council were empowered to require more local truant officers, or to have power to "remove any truant officer found by them to be incompetent, and to appoint a competent successor."

On May 21, 1913, the state made elementary school education a minimum training for all children under sixteen by providing that ability to "read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language" would not secure labor certificates for such children, but that "such child shall have completed the course of study prescribed for the elementary schools."

---

[44] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 13, Session Laws of 1903.

[45] *Ibid.,* Chap. 139, Session Laws of 1911.

[46] *Ibid.,* Chap. 162, Session Laws of 1911.

In this period from 1885 to 1919, then, the state had taken over practically all power to determine conditions of school attendance which had formerly resided in the local authorities, and here, as in so many other departments of educational endeavor, the legislature of 1919 found the state of New Hampshire with a rather fully accepted theory that the state is well within the proper limits of its powers when it prescribes to local school authorities the conditions under which a child can be compelled to be in attendance upon a public school.

As another feature of the state's campaign to secure the attendance of all of its children at school came the passage, in 1913, of what is known as the Mothers' Aid law.[47] It provided that the county commissioners were to provide funds "not otherwise appropriated" from the county treasury,

> . . . for the partial support of women, when such women are of good repute but poor and dependent on their own efforts for support and are mothers of children under the age of sixteen years.

Ten dollars was to be given each month for one child, and five dollars more for each additional child. Children must be living with the mother, and no aid was to be given unless, in its absence, the mother "would be required to work regularly away from her home and children," and "such allowance shall, in the judgment of the school board, be necessary to save the child or children from neglect." The mother must "be a proper person morally, physically and mentally, for the bringing up of her children," in the judgment of the school board, and have been a resident of the county at least two years to be eligible for this aid. When a child became sixteen years of age, the payment was to stop, but the school board might recommend cessation of payment at any time before.

This act was not intended as a measure of poor relief. Its express purpose was to enable destitute mothers to keep a home intact and their children in school. Boards of county commissioners failed to provide funds for payments in many cases, however, since they insisted that they found no county funds "not otherwise appropriated." Accordingly, the state was forced to take over financing of the work, and in an amendment [48] in 1915 stipulated that,

---

[47] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 123, Session Laws of 1913.

> It shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to recommend a special appropriation at each session of the legislature of an amount sufficient to meet the purposes of this act for the partial support of mothers.

The new law then provided for payments in amount equal to those of the original act, $8,000 being appropriated for the work. The mother was to petition her local school board for aid, and they were required to make a recommendation "and shall file the same, together with a copy of such mother's petition, with the department of public instruction." The state education department should then investigate the case, "and may increase or decrease the amount of such allowance at any time thereafter."

Thus came a state appropriation to enable needy mothers to keep their children in school. The work has been administered by the state education department since that time. In discussing the matter the 1926 *Report* of the State Board, says,[49]

> The annual appropriation is $40,000 and aid is furnished to about one hundred fifty widowed and dependent mothers. In their homes are about five hundred children under sixteen years of age and half as many more older children. The law was justified and the appropriation has made possible, with small per capita expense, suitable homes for some thousands of children.

In addition to this work the state department of education was empowered to undertake investigation and relief of social conditions in homes and communities which made school attendance of children irregular. This work has been carried on for almost two decades now, and each year the department handles many cases involving immorality, broken homes, child abuse, and feeblemindedness. The 1926 *Report* of the State Board of Education discusses about one hundred twenty such cases handled in the biennium by the office. Running through it all, as in the reports of preceding years, is a never-ending story of feebleminded degeneracy, and that the state's educational authorities are not unaware of the nature of the problem is shown in the fact that Chapter III of the

---

[48] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 132, Session Laws of 1915.

[49] *Report of the State Board of Education,* 1925-1926, p. 90.

1926 *Report* is given over to discussion of the New Hampshire problem of feeblemindedness.

As part of the compulsory education and attendance program of the state there was passed in 1901 a law [50] specifying that,

> Upon petition of five per cent of the legal voters of any city or town having more than five thousand inhabitants, . . . said city, or town, shall establish and maintain, in addition to the schools required by law to be maintained therein, evening schools for the instruction of persons over fourteen years of age in such branches of learning and art as the school board shall deem expedient.

These schools were to be under the superintendence of the local school boards. Their purpose was to make effective the illiteracy provision of the child labor act of the same year. It has been noted that New Hampshire had, in the last part of the nineteenth century, acquired a large body of immigrants, and the problem of adult illiteracy continued to be a serious one until finally, at the entrance of the United States into the World War, it attracted such attention that it became the original impetus to the educational investigation which resulted in the school law of 1919. Under that act the state did not weaken, but rather strengthened, its program of attack in the field of adult education.

It has been noted in considering the district system that health conditions in the schools were not always proper owing to the existence of poor and unsanitary houses. The whole problem of pupil health had been left to the local authorities. With the growth of state influence, however, there came insistence that the health of school children be safeguarded. Acts [51] were passed requiring vaccination of all school children in public and private schools. Moreover, in 1901, it was made the law,[52] that,

> No parent, guardian, person or persons having the custody of any child shall permit such child, if infected with any communicable disease, or has been exposed to such, to attend any public or private school.

A more fundamental move was made in 1913 when an act [53] was passed aiming at full medical inspection in the public schools. This law was not mandatory. It provided, however, that,

---

[50] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 112, Session Laws of 1901.

[51] *Ibid.*, Chap. 19, Session Laws of 1901.

[52] *Ibid.*, Chap. 16, Session Laws of 1901.

[53] *Ibid.*, Chap. 83, Session Laws of 1913.

> Whenever any city, union, special or town school district shall adopt the provisions of this act . . . the school board of the city or town, in which such school district is located, shall appoint one or more school physicians of not less than five years of experience, . . . and shall provide them with all proper facilities for the performance of their duties.

These physicians were to "make such an examination of every pupil, except such as are hereinafter exempted, and of every teacher, janitor, and other employees of the school . . . and of the school buildings, yards, and surroundings thereof as protection of the health of the pupils may require." It was provided, however, that,

> Any parent or guardian may protest in writing to the teacher against the examination of his or her child or ward, and such pupil shall thereafter be exempted from any examination for or on account of any non-contagious disease or defect.

Thus some power was left to localism. Adoption of the provisions of the act was optional, but a 1917 Act[54] made it compulsory for the school board to include in the warrant for school election a provision relating to the adoption of this medical inspection. The local districts might refuse it, but they were not permitted to ignore it. And state power, not through compulsion, but by means of insistent education has, in all the years since, shown an unceasing determination to protect its school children against local ignorance and superstition.

In the pages of this chapter has been attempted a survey of the growth of state power and influence in the period following the abandonment of the district system. Again it must be emphasized that only the outstanding features of the movement can be noted in a study of this nature. Interesting and valuable details would fill volumes. Indeed, they do so, and are found in very readable form in the reports of the State Education department for all these years. The legal steel work around which the detailed educational structure has been shaped, and which has determined the direction and proportions of its building has been sketched in this chapter. The more one examines the details, however, the more is he convinced that their whole trend is with the basic structure. In the educational fundamentals of teacher training and certification, school supervision, financial support,

[54] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 114, Session Laws of 1917.

school attendance, health and sanitation, secondary education, adult education and illiteracy, and general school administration and control, New Hampshire was swinging toward a policy of greater centralization of power in the hands of state authorities, and a consequent state system of public schools with state-wide standards, policies, and practices.

It would seem, however, that there was greater willingness to adopt new policies and ideals than to abandon old administrative machinery and accept new and more effective structures for getting results. The prejudice and tradition of localism seems to cluster more around the *forms* of administrative tools than about the basic principles and results which are involved. The result is that local policy and convictions are probably always much in advance of local willingness to adopt new machinery in order to make practice of these beliefs possible. For this reason the legislature of 1919 found the state with a rather well-developed system of educational theory and a faith in the value of certain school procedures, but with lack of an effective administrative scheme to bring realization of these conceptions into practice. There had been an attempt to put new educational wine into old administrative bottles. New Hampshire evidently desired a state system of schools but had provided no potent state administrative system. It has been noted in the preceding chapter that a series of laws had made various changes in the state department of education and in state boards. They had never possessed any real powers, however, beyond those of recommendation and advocacy of educational procedures.

> For a full generation the state office was but a shadowy institution with a series of executive officers, commissioners of common schools, secretaries of the state board of education, superintendents of public instruction, each serving for a short time. In the thirty-three years, closing in 1880, there were nineteen changes in this position and four years was the longest term of office. Clergymen, college professors and principals of private academies served the state in this limited capacity. The law gave them slight authority but they visited schools, held conferences, lectured on educational topics and slowly the impression grew that education was a state function.[55]

With the increasing growth of the centralizing movement resulting in the abandonment of the district system in 1885 came a growth in the power of the state department. The preceding pages cite many representative examples of legislation giving to the state office increased authority in matters of school attendance, child labor, health, teacher certification, and other school problems. But the educational administrative system of the state, built thus piecemeal, was not a system, at all. It was a confusing and contradictory series of compromises.

---

[55] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 51.

> The last attempt at complete school legislation was in 1849, when previous laws were repealed and reënacted in comprehensive form.
>
> In the ensuing years nearly sixty legislatures had met and many of them had amended the statutes of 1849 or the amendments to these statutes. The result was a body of school law cumbersome, confusing and frequently contradictory.[56]

Such was the situation in New Hampshire educational administration which confronted the legislature of 1919, and which existed because of, or in spite of all that had been done in nearly three hundred years of educational effort. It is but necessary here, in concluding the discussion of that portion of this development which came from 1885 to 1919, to note again that its basic feature was that of the growth in influence of the state as the unit of educational organization, administration, and support. Local control had been given full opportunity to demonstrate its worth. It had been found wanting in power to furnish solutions to new and pressing problems. Starting at first with a small surrender of powers, the local communities had found by experience that they could secure desired results better in some regards through use of their state government and wider administrative forces. But at the same time they had discovered that education cannot be secured without paying for it. If a poor district could not educate its children through its own resources, alone, then either they must go uneducated, or someone else must help bear the expense. And the state in the end came to accept the principle that children are not children of the district, but children of the state.

In general it may be said, then, of the educational legislation of the period from 1885 to 1919 that, before the act of 1919 ever became law, the state of New Hampshire had accepted the principles of state-wide responsibility for education of the children of the whole state, and professional supervision and administration of school procedures and activities. However, it has been noted that nothing of any real importance had been done since 1867 to provide a state-wide administrative organization with power to exert necessary pressures and prescribe necessary techniques. Professional supervision had not been made mandatory. Local ignorance and stubbornness could yet rob a child of his right to the aid of educational science and discovery in securing his education. State financial aid had been offered to backward communities as a bait, and had not been administered as a medicine. Professional supervision had been presented as something educationally desirable but not necessary. Great progress had been made since 1885. Some false doctrines had been disproved and some fundamental principles established. But administrative machinery was still lacking to bring these principles to full fruition.

---

[56] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1923-1924, p. 56.

In the succeeding chapter may be found a consideration and summarization of educational conditions in the state as they existed in 1919 previous to the passage of the law reorganizing the educational administrative system. Following this summarization is a study of New Hampshire's legislative attempt to correct the faults as they existed. In general it may be said that this legislation of 1919 shows development of no new educational policies beyond and different from those of this period of 1885 to 1919 except in the construction of administrative machinery which would make more completely possible the realization of the principles which had come to be accepted in this period. These principles were, first, that, "We must tax the wealth of the state wherever it is for the benefit of the children wherever they may reside," and second, that a professional educator is no more dangerous to the institutions of democracy and the cherished rights of a local community than is an unprofessional educator, and that his special study of the problems of education and his accumulated experience in the work of the schools fit him to create, organize, and evaluate school policies and procedures with a degree of fruitfulness for good such as can seldom crown the efforts of a committee of school laymen, however fine their characters and laudable their ambitions.

CHAPTER VII

FINAL STEPS TOWARD A STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

I. CONDITIONS CULMINATING IN THE SCHOOL LAW OF 1919

It is almost a truism that social crises reveal the strengths and weaknesses of social institutions. The World War gave numerous and classic examples. This great crisis in the affairs of practically all the peoples of the earth called forth the marshalling of the world's mightiest energies and a searching re-examination of all social values and instruments. The institutions of New Hampshire were not spared.

In April, 1918, at the instance of the federal government, a State Americanization Committee was appointed as a subcommittee of the New Hampshire State Committee on Public Safety. In its attempts to discover ways and means for inculcation of American ideals in New Hampshire's large contingent of foreign born, this committee early reached the conclusion that its ends could be best and most surely accomplished through the agency of the public schools. There was undertaken, therefore, a careful examination of the school laws in force in New Hampshire, and the extent and nature of public provision for education under these statutes, and also a practical examination of the powers of the state department of education over the educational processes of the state, and what was being accomplished thereby.

As the examination proceeded, it became increasingly evident to this committee that the school laws operative in New Hampshire were not only inadequate to provide for Americanization, but in some respects at least were unsuited to provide for the normal educational needs of a people in a modern and rapidly changing social and industrial state. The conditions disclosed finally aroused such interest among prominent educators and public-spirited people of the state that the governor-elect requested eight outstanding citizens to serve as a committee, "conferring freely with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction," to make an investigation and review of the entire public school system of the state and advise what should be attempted to remedy discovered defects. The work was undertaken, and on December 20, 1918, the committee submitted its report. There could probably be prepared no better general summarization of educational conditions prevailing in New Hampshire, after nearly three hundred years of effort under varying degrees of state and local control, than that which was given to the legislature of 1919 in the final report of this committee.

A consideration of the outstanding features of this report should enable one, first, to get some correct conception of the shortcomings which exisited in spite of all that had been done since the abolition of the district system in 1885, and second, to understand the nature of the educational problems which pressed upon the 1919 legislature for solution and shaped the provisions of the new statute. The nature of this study forbids presentation of the detailed report. One may, however, learn of the shortcomings of the New Hampshire school system by reviewing certain key statements which present the conclusions from this fair and sympathetic survey by the state's own citizenry. It is desired here to point out especially those portions of the report which are concerned with organization, administration, and support of public education, and the desirability of a greater or less degree of centralization of power in educational authority. Under the heading, "Defects in the System of the Public Schools in New Hampshire," the report says, in part:[1]

> In order that education shall be effective it must be organized. The usual and reasonable unit of organization in America is the State. . . . It is coming to be generally recognized that not only altruism but intelligent self interest demands the bringing up to standard of backward portions of any community. The healthful and enlightened section of a city is nevertheless subject to the contagion of an epidemic which originates within a forlorn portion of the community. . . . In no less marked degree the body politic may be subjected to the dangers of ill-considered or illogical thinking on the part of communities, for the development of whose mental processes the state may, with apparent reason, attempt to avoid accountability.
>
> Inasmuch as it is granted by general consent that the state is the proper unit within which to develop the organization of free public instruction, that state in which organized education of the public school system is not

[1] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1919-1920, p. 12.

available in like degree to all classes or to all sections cannot escape stigma at a time when the importance of education is recognized as never before. . . .

. . . It is inevitable that with the insufficient knowledge in many communities of the factors which affect children's health, physical harm shall be done within the public schools. . . . The lack of cleanliness through inadequate janitor service, the lack of proper ventilation through insufficient regard for the advantages of fresh air, and the lack of competent supervision of sanitary provisions are evils in many a school toward which too often local school boards are blind. Yet authority and responsibility and adequate inspection service are not so placed, either in the Department of Public Instruction or elsewhere, that the state can have knowledge and say through a properly accredited agent, "These things shall not be," with any certainty that they will be corrected.

. . . Children at the most susceptible age ought by no possibility to be subjected to the influence of teachers whose qualifications on the side of character are not positive rather than negative. . . . It constitutes a menace always to some proportion of the children of the state in regard to which action cannot be taken, either by the Department of Public Instruction or by other agency, until the matter reaches proportions which bring it within the purview of the criminal courts.

As at other points where strong commendation can be given, the conditions in regard to mental attainments of teachers in the elementary and secondary school system are as good as they are because of the unceasing and intelligent exertion of moral influence on the part of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and his aids, rather than because of any inevitable result of the working of a thoughtfully conceived and properly organized system in which the State assumed large responsibility and to which it delegated due authority.

There are few states which do not require teachers to prove qualifications for their work before being allowed to accept employment, but New Hampshire does not! . . . Neither certification nor examination is required, and at will school boards may employ ignorant, diseased, or immoral persons as teachers, and some do! . . . The standards of the State should be established, and any child within the State, whether residing in one of its municipalities, its farming towns, its lumbering sections, or its industrial villages, should be assured by the State of education of like quality with that afforded any other child of the State, insofar as this is humanly possible.

This can only be accomplished by the defining of educational principles, the organization of educational system, and the delegating of authority in such distinct way that the State can insure a large common denominator of educational welfare to any child within its boundaries. . . .

No state in New England makes legal requirement of so little in the way of supervision in its schools, and in no state of this section of the country is the village or town left so free to ignore its school responsibilities, from whatever motive this tendency arises in the occasional community.

> Furthermore, there is not even the elementary requirement of a prescribed number of weeks in which children of the State shall be afforded educational facilities. Incompetent school boards are at liberty to shorten the school year in certain sections to a minimum within which reasonable work is impossible. . . . For the purpose of saving taxation or for other motives less intelligible, the school year runs as low in one town as sixteen weeks, and in other towns as low as twenty weeks. Such unfortunate conditions would, of course, be impossible if the State had sufficiently recognized its problem and its obligation in this matter.
>
> . . . the work of the Department of Public Instruction has been done in large measure by the sheer influence of an able personnel intelligently directing its efforts, and has not been due to a continuous and systematic attempt on the part of the State to devise and to maintain a system of education worthy of the good name of New Hampshire.
>
> If substantiation is desired for any of the statements of this report, it can be afforded, but the purpose of the report is not to go into detail or to catalogue specific instances, but rather to draw attention to the general fact that the public school system of New Hampshire instead of being the subject of particular and specific solicitude on the part of the State has lacked both the support and the interest by which alone it can be put into accord with the needs of the time.

Before taking up its discussion of suggested remedies, the committee report summarizes this statement of defects as follows:

> 1. No other state in New England is so lax in enforcing recognition of school responsibilities.
> 2. There is no power lodged in any official or officials sufficient to insure proper administration of schools or to establish and maintain proper educational standards.
> 3. Supervision of schools and teachers is optional and lacking where most needed.
> 4. No authority exists either to guarantee conditions necessary to the health of pupils or secure attention to easily remedied physical defects.
> 5. Educational opportunity is neither equal nor universal.
> 6. There is no standard school year nor annual minimum of work required of pupils by the State.
> 7. There are no provisions for schools in the unorganized parts of the State.
> 8. There are no compulsory evening schools though according to the census of 1910, 26,783 of the population of the state cannot use the English language, to say nothing of our native-born illiterates.

One has here, then, a summarization of educational conditions as they were in New Hampshire in 1918, and as evaluated by a group of its own citizens. An analysis of the defects as shown by the report may group them under two large heads. First, there are faults in the system of organization and administration, and second, faults in the system of financial support.

The administrative deficiencies existed because of lack of any official or group which might possess authority to decide and enforce proper standards in teacher qualification, supervision, health, and general pedagogical procedures. The faults in the system of support had come into being with social, economic, and population movements of the preceding century. The policy of state aid, already in use in New Hampshire, was failing to meet conditions satisfactorily because of faults in the system of organizing and administering the educational work of the state. Equalization of educational opportunity had been desired but had not been provided through the system of organization employed.

In previous chapters, information has been presented concerning economic and social developments which had precipitated serious social and educational conditions and problems in New Hampshire. It seems well to review this condition once more in order that there may be no misunderstanding of the motives which prompted the provisions of the legislation of 1919.

The heart of the educational problem of 1919 is to be found in the following statistics: [2]

CHANGES IN POPULATION BY DECADES

DECADE	TOTAL POPULATION IN 235 ORGANIZED TOWNS	POPULATION IN 135 AGRICULTURAL TOWNS	POPULATION IN 100 INDUSTRIAL TOWNS
1840	282,874	139,326	143,548
1850	316,931	139,089	177,842
1860	327,100	133,864	193,236
1870	318,390	117,739	200,651
1880	345,612	110,121	235,491
1890	375,406	97,799	277,607
1900	412,270	91,250	321,020
1910	431,718	82,719	348,999
1920	443,612	74,438	369,174

Summarizing these facts and figures one has:

135 Agricultural Towns.

1840 Average total population	1,032
1920 Average total population	551
Average loss	481

---

[2] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 170.

In 80 years these towns had lost 46.6 per cent of their population.

100 Industrial Cities and Towns.

1840 Average total population	1,435
1920 Average total population	3,691
Average gain	2,256

In 80 years these towns had gained 257.2 per cent in population.

New Hampshire has about twenty organized towns which have a population of not over two hundred. Very few of these have an effective town organization, nor is the town business regularly and efficiently administered. In some cases anarchy exists and in others a temporary monarchy has been established by a single family and its adherents.[3]

That one may understand and appreciate the nature of the social and educational problems which were welling up out of this trend in wealth and population, it seems proper to quote here from the 1915-1916 *Report* of the State Board of Education,[4] where a condition is described that was found in one New Hampshire town by the state superintendent in his investigation of a non-attendance case. Giving the name of the town the report says:

> Personally investigated by state superintendent on complaint. The town was covered territorially. The officers were visited in their homes. Several other homes were visited, as well as the two schools. Inquiries were made of well-informed persons in Peterborough and Temple, bordering towns. The record of practically every adult in town was followed up and checked up. The town is small, the last census giving a population of 71,122 in 1900. There are reported to be 14 children in the two schools. In general, the story is one of financial ignorance or crookedness, it is hard to tell which, in both public and private affairs; hard cider drinking and illicit liquor selling; sexual immorality almost amounting to promiscuity; feeble-mindedness and insanity. It is a hilltop retreat into which the shiftless and incompetent and criminal of low mentality have drifted for generations, while the opposites have moved away.
>
> It is hopeless for the state government to expect popular education to be carried on in this town. It is not capable of managing its own schools, even in a poor way. Legislation ought to be enacted providing that the court may in such a case annul the district government and appoint a responsible person to temporarily administer the district and report to the court.
>
> I know of no other such extreme case in the state, although several others approximate these conditions.

---

[3] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 173.

[4] *Ibid.,* 1915-1916, p. 54.

In the preceding chapter was noted legislation permitting the towns of the state to unite for the purpose of forming supervisory unions and employing competent superintendents. This permissive statute was helpful, but it had not solved the problem. The towns which needed supervision most refused or neglected to use the opportunity. More drastic legislation was needed. Discussing the matter in 1918, State Superintendent Butterfield gave the opinion [5] that,

> The present law has, however, three glaring defects.
>
> It is unequal in application. The entire state has become convinced of the benefits which came from putting schools under expert supervision. In spite of this a considerable number of districts remain without supervision. . . . In general the schools in these unsupervised towns are widely separated with the attendant difficulty of supervision. . . . They realize the value of good schools but they can not afford them. . . .
>
> It is uneconomical in operation. For economical supervision contiguous towns should be joined. This is not now the case and districts are composed of units widely separated geographically.

There are then cited cases of towns fifty miles apart which were joined in Supervisory Union.

> It is not clear in its terms. The present law gives no specific duties to superintendents, except that they must grant employment certificates. Each superintendent has only such powers and duties as his board may wish to delegate to him. This permits great divergence in practice.

In spite, then, of the state aided efforts to secure professional supervision, the very portions of the state which needed it most were without it. Sixteen per cent of the children of the state, living in 112 districts, were in places which could not afford supervision [6] under the provisions of the existing law, and administrative limitations made the law sterile in very many other towns and places. The permissive supervisory union had started a good work, but it could not consummate it.

In the succeeding chapter, comparison is made of educational conditions in New Hampshire in the years following the passage of the 1919 Law as contrasted with conditions in the period preceding this legislation. If one wishes, he may find there further information regarding educational affairs which precipitated the legislation of 1919. An unprejudiced estimate, however, seems to lead to the opinion that the addition of data and its detailed analysis but serves to support and strengthen the conclusion of the governor-elect's advisory committee as presented to the legislature of 1919. Its members had gone thoroughly and honestly into the matter and had boldly pronounced the state's educational system wanting in some important regards. These shortages were not so much in the educational ideals and desires of the people of New Hampshire. They were rather in lack of proper provision for equitable financial support of an adequate educational program, and of properly organized and empowered administrative machinery to render potential and fruitful the sincere aspirations of the state's people in their efforts to rear a creative and law-abiding citizenry.

---

[5] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1917-1918, p. 142.

[6] *Ibid.,* 1917-1918, p. 144.

> "We should not forget," says the governor-elect's committee in closing its report,[7] "that our school children are legally, socially and economically wards of the State, and that the responsibility of the State cannot be fully satisfied unless for every child, it provides instruction by competent teachers, under expert supervision, in wholesome school buildings and for full school years. The foregoing report shows that our present system falls far short of such a standard.

Educationally, then, New Hampshire refused to stick her head in the sand in 1918. Through this committee of citizens the state deliberately put its educational system in the scales and found it wanting. It turned then to the legislature and demanded a solution to the problem. The answer was the school law of 1919.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE SCHOOL LAW OF 1919 AND RESULTANT ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

When the report of Governor Bartlett's Advisory Committee was submitted to the legislature of New Hampshire, it contained not only the survey of defects which has been considered above, but also clear-cut suggestions for remedial action. The legislature, therefore, invited the assistance of this committee in drafting a bill to make its own recommendations effective. This bill was introduced, numerous public hearings were held, and the proposed legislation given widest possible publicity "to the end that every citizen of the state might have the fullest information regarding the proposed changes in our educational system and have opportunity to formulate and submit any objections."[8] The work of the committee was greatly influenced by the Vermont school law of 1915 which was the result of an intensive study of that state's educational system by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The bill, as finally drafted, followed in the main the recommendations of the advisory committee, was passed by the legislature, signed by the governor, and became the law of New Hampshire[9] on March 28, 1919.

---

[7] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 23.

It is impossible here to consider the detailed provisions of the 1919 school law. Nor is it necessary. For the purposes of this study, it is needful only that we note and evaluate the changes which it made in the method of organization, administration, and support of schools in New Hampshire and its effects in creating a state system of education out of the variant, uncoördinated, and localized educational practices which had prevailed, more or less, for nearly three hundred years in the state.

As one begins consideration of this law, he is impressed with the fact that New Hampshire was no longer laboring under any illusion as to the fundamental causes of her educational ills. Nor was "local self-government" permitted to prescribe another nostrum. The legislature boldly seized a knife, anesthetized tradition and "localism," and deftly extracted the cancerous growth. The guiding motives can be stated no better than as given by the advisory committee in its suggestions for remedies for the ills which its investigation had revealed. It says:[10]

> A common language and ability on the part of citizens to think intelligently are essential to the existence of free institutions, consequently the State should not only provide adequate educational opportunity for everyone who resides within its boundaries but also see to it that those for whose benefit such opportunity is provided make the best possible use of it.
>
> The realization of an approach to this ideal is impossible under our present school laws. The plan for improving present conditions which appeals to the committee is a modification of that now in use in Vermont. The theory this plan is intended to effectuate is that such a public school system as the State needs cannot be effectively administered without the exercise of large powers. Such powers cannot wisely be given to a single official nor to a body composed exclusively of persons occupying educational posts and subject to the blinding influence of special theories of education. If this view of the matter is sound, the necessary power should be given

---

[8] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 28.

[9] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 106, Session Laws of 1919.

[10] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 19.

> to a board composed of practical citizens of wisdom and prudence who, while possessing such knowledge of educational matters as will enable them to arbitrate questions of educational principles and policy with good judgment and sagacity, can be trusted to steer clear of the vagaries and extravagances inherent in many educational theories. In short, there should be a governing board composed of practical persons and an executive department composed of educational experts; for while our schools must be carried on under expert direction, this direction should be exercised with due consideration for prevailing economic and social conditions and in such a way as to exclude costly educational experiments. . . .

The recommendation became the law. As if to be hurried to the task of supplying the strategic administrative lack, the very first section of the new statute [11] provided that,

> A board to be designated as the State Board of Education, consisting of five members, in addition to the governor, as member ex-officio, is hereby created. The members, not more than three of whom shall belong to the same political party, shall not be technical educators nor professionally engaged in school work, but public-spirited and interested citizens willing to serve the state without pay and to give the time necessary for an understanding of the educational needs of the state, and of the best way to supply them.

Here, though, was nothing to disturb New Hampshire "localism." Several laws in the past had provided for a state board of education, and always things had gone on about as usual out in the little local district. But here again the state, through its legislature, was laboring under no mistaken conception regarding the seat of the trouble. And so, after providing for the appointment of the board members by the governor and council for a five-year term, one retiring each year, and for their removal by the same power for good causes, the law introduced to New Hampshire something entirely new for a state board of education—genuine and far-reaching *powers!* No description of these powers can excel in brevity and clearness the statement of the law's provisions.

> The state board shall have the same powers of management, supervision and direction over all public schools in this state as the directors of the ordinary business corporation have over the business of the corporation, except as its powers and duties may be limited by law. It may make all rules and regulations necessary for the management of its own business and for the conduct of its officers, employees and agents, and further may make such rules and regulations as may seem desirable to secure the

---

[11] *Laws of New Hampshire,* Chap. 106, Session Laws of 1919.

> efficient administration of the public schools and the administration of the work of Americanization in teaching English to non-English-speaking adults and in furnishing instruction in the privileges, duties and responsibilities of citizenship, which is hereby declared to be an essential part of public school education; and it shall be the duty of school boards and employees of school districts to comply with the rules and regulations of the state board.

Here, for the first time in its history, the state had created an administrative authority having large and state-wide powers. Administrative organization was at last provided for a genuine *state system* of schools in New Hampshire. The lengths to which the centralization movement was extended are shown in a section of the law which stipulates that,

> The state board shall exercise the powers and perform the duties now exercised and performed by the superintendent of public instruction, the trustees of the state normal schools, the state board for vocational education, and shall take over the business of the above-named officers and boards. . . .

The governor's advisory committee had suggested that "there should be a governing board composed of practical persons and an executive department composed of educational experts." The provision for the state board had provided the "governing board." The new law then proceeded to provide for "educational experts."

> The state board shall employ a skilled executive officer who shall have had training and experience in educational work. Such person shall be the chief executive officer of said board and shall be its secretary, and shall be called the commissioner of education. Said commissioner shall be appointed for an indefinite term and shall be subject to removal upon the majority vote of the entire board, and said board shall fix his salary and prescribe his duties except as the same may be prescribed by law. Said commissioner need not be a resident of the state at the time of his appointment. (Sec. 6.)

Through this provision New Hampshire had for the first time a school executive into whose hands were given greater powers than to advise, report, and inspire. Through this executive the state board of education was to exercise the wide and definite powers given to it by the law. Having in mind the conditions which had prevailed in New Hampshire to motivate this legislation, and the established traditions, usages, and administrative methods of nearly three hundred years of New Hampshire educational endeavor, one may well consider carefully some of the sharp changes in policy which are exhibited in provisions of the new law. Having provided for the governing and executive branches of the new administrative system, and for the general scope and nature of administrative powers, the new law marched out into the "rights of local self-government" and provided that "the state board, through the commissioner of education acting as the executive officer of the board" should have power to "combine the several school districts of the state into supervisory unions"; to "supervise the expenditure of all moneys appropriated under this act, and inspect all institutions in which or by which such moneys are used"; to "establish standard elementary schools in unorganized parts of the state"; to employ as many agents and deputies as may be necessary for performance of its duties; to "hold conferences from time to time with superintendents and teachers"; and to "prepare, publish and distribute such school programs, outlines of work and courses of study as will best promote the educational interests of the state."

Nor was this all. For nearly three hundred years some degree of local and unprofessional ignorance or wisdom had been prescribing the qualifications and judging the fitness of New Hampshire's teachers and other educational workers in the public schools. In one short section of the new law all this came to an end.

> The state board shall prescribe the qualifications and duties of the deputy commissioners. . . . of all superintendents and assistant superintendents and teachers employed in the public schools. . . .

If one adds to all these provisions that which empowers the state board in the matter of school supervision it may be seen that here, indeed, was a state administrative and fiscal educational organization with the "same powers of management, supervision and direction over all public schools . . . as the directors of the ordinary business corporation have over the business of the corporation." Empowered to "combine the several districts in the state into supervisory unions," the state board was given further powers to determine the nature of school supervision by the law's provision that,

> Upon consultation with the local school boards in each of said supervisory unions and upon the nomination by said school boards of a suitable and competent person, the state board shall employ such person as superin-

> tendent, . . . and may remove a superintendent or assistant superintendent when the interests of the schools require it.

Limitations of this study do not permit detailed consideration of the provisions of the law. Here have been sketched the large outlines of the administrative organization which was provided. If there be added to this an intelligible exposition of the law's provision for the financial support of the new system, one should have a dependable conception of the type of organization which was created by the 1919 school law in New Hampshire.

The new law established a basis for the system of support in a provision that,

> The selectmen in each town shall assess an annual tax of three dollars and fifty cents on each thousand dollars of the value of the ratable estate taxable therein for the support of the public schools.

With this as a minimal basis the act then continues:

> In any district in which the money produced by a tax of five dollars on a thousand dollars of the value of the ratable estates in the district is insufficient to maintain the required elementary and special schools, and to purchase the required text books, scholars' supplies, flags and appurtenances, the state board shall provide the balance of the money necessary from the money appropriated for that purpose by the provisions of this act. In districts so aided the state board, acting through the local school boards, shall administer all money available for the maintenance of the public schools and shall account for the money raised by the districts as well as that furnished by the state.

That there might be a system of school taxation where no local taxing power existed, it was provided that,

> The state treasurer shall annually assess a tax of three dollars and fifty cents on the thousand dollars of the value of the ratable estates taxable in the unorganized parts of the state for the benefit of the public schools . . . and the tax shall be collected in the same way as the state tax. (Sec. 23.)

Further state funds were secured through a demand that,

> Each school district in the state shall pay to the state treasurer on or before December 1 in each year, as its share of the expense incident to state wide supervision of the public schools, a sum equal to two dollars for each child residing in the district who was enrolled in the public schools in the last preceding school year, and the selectmen shall annually assess upon the value of the ratable estate of the district a sum sufficient for this purpose. (Sec. 10.)

The act stipulated that the Literary Fund "should be used for the purposes of this act," and then rounded out the sum total of funds for support of the new system by stating that,

> The sum of $162,100 for the year ending August 31, 1920, and $150,700 for the year ending August 31, 1921 in addition to the Literary Fund and the fund created by sections 10 and 23 and any money paid into the State Treasury under section 9 of this act to be paid out of the treasury of the state is appropriated for the said years. . . .

and that

> The sums of $273,400 and $284,800 appropriated for the years ending August 31, 1920, and August 31, 1921 for school purposes by acts of this session are hereby appropriated and made available for the purposes of this act for said year.

Thus were funds provided for the support of the educational ideals of the people of New Hampshire in 1919, and to secure the realization of which they had created a new system of administration. There have been some minor changes in the details of the system of support, but in general the system as inaugurated has remained. In the next chapter may be found a short discussion of the merits of the new system of support as compared with that which it superseded, and likewise a statement regarding the purposes for which the money has been expended. Here may be noted only the general purposes for which the law provides that the available funds may be spent. It stipulates that expenditure may be made,

> For the abolition of illiteracy and for the instruction of illiterates over sixteen years of age in common school branches and in the privileges, duties and responsibilities of citizenship.
>
> For the Americanization of immigrants, for the teaching of those sixteen years of age and over to speak and read English and to appreciate and respect the civic and social institutions of the United States, and for instruction in the duties of citizenship.
>
> For equalizing educational opportunity and improving the public schools below college grade, with the definite aim of extending school terms, stimulating local interest and improving, through better instruction, gradation and supervision all rural schools and schools in sparsely settled localities.
>
> For promotion of the physical health and recreation of pupils and for their medical and dental examination.
>
> For the determination of mental and physical defects, for the employment of school nurses and the instruction of pupils in the principles of health and sanitation.

> For preparing teachers for the schools, particularly for rural schools, for encouraging a more nearly universal preparation of prospective teachers, and for extending the facilities for the improvement of teachers already in the service.
>
> For the expense of administration of the department of education.
>
> For making available the funds provided by federal law for vocational or other education.
>
> For the payment of tuition in high schools as provided in Laws. . . .
>
> For the aid of dependent mothers as provided in Laws. . . .

In this manner, then, did New Hampshire meet the educational evils which the World War had revealed. Clinging to the ancient ideals of their fathers, the people of the state turned to new instruments for their realization—a new scheme of organization, a widened and strengthened power in administration, and a state-wide system of financial support. There have been some detailed changes in the provisions of the law since 1919, but in its essence it remains as first enacted.

It has been noted that the state board of education is empowered to make all rules necessary to an efficient and fruitful administration of the public schools of the state. Into its hands is given power such as no New Hampshire school authority had ever before possessed. It is not too much to say that the 1919 Law, in spite of all modifying provisions, represents a very high degree of centralization of power in educational control. It is not possible here to give detailed consideration to the policies of the state board as it has guided the destinies of the school system of New Hampshire, but a fair conception of its interpretation of the use which it might properly make of the powers which are given to it by the law can probably be no more clearly gained than from an address of the Chairman of the Board to a "Joint Business Conference" of all the local school boards and superintendents with the state board at the state house, October 16, 1919. He said, in part: [12]

> While the general powers vested in the State Board are large and comprehensive in giving the board the same control and direction over the business of the public school system as the directors of a business corporation have to control and direct the business of the corporation, this board believes that the highest value and usefulness of the granted powers rests on the fact that they will enable the board, with the commissioner, deputies and the rest of its official organization, including the superintendents,

---

[12] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 55.

effectively to aid the local school boards to create better schools in every school district in the state.

The State Board as now constituted will act in accordance with that belief. Their powers will be used solely for helpful coöperation with superintendents and local school boards for the general betterment of our public school system, which the educational bill was designed to accomplish.

The State Board is given power to make rules and regulations on all branches of public school business, and of course such rules and regulations will be made—but never without the fullest consideration of all the information we can obtain as to their usefulness and practicability. Such information must largely come from our official staff, the superintendents and the local school boards, and we must rely upon them to keep the State Board fully informed.

If unwittingly we shall adopt any general regulation which turns out to be undesirable or impracticable of execution, we shall, of course, quickly hear from you or others about it; and if, upon review, we become satisfied that a mistake has been made, we shall not hesitate frankly to admit it and make correction.

One great virtue of the law is its workable elasticity, which does not confine the State Board to any fore-ordained or legally established course of procedure, but enables it to supervise, control and direct the business of the public school system with the same sort of common and business sense which you and other successful citizens use in dealing with your important business affairs.

Such, in general, is the system of organization, administration, and financial support which the law of 1919 brought to public education in New Hampshire. On April 29, 1919, Governor Bartlett announced the appointment of the new board of education. Ernest W. Butterfield, who for some years had been State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was immediately appointed by the board as Commissioner of Education, and, on September 1, 1919, in accordance with the provisions of the Act, New Hampshire took up her ancient quest for a greater and more fruitful system of public education, clothed in the garb of an administrative theory and practice which was not a little strange upon the countryside from whence had gathered almost three hundred years of sovereign New England town meetings.

CHAPTER VIII

EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT UNDER THE SCHOOL LAW OF 1919

The ultimate end of educational policy and legislation is not to secure efficient organization, nor is the final purpose of organization to achieve perfection in administrative practice and financial support. The master of theory and practice in educational organization and administration is the first to admit this—indeed, to insist upon it. Organization, administrative policy and technique, and effective fiscal practices are but means. The end sought is increased educational attainment in the group which maintains the schools, the realization of the values which are cherished and with which task the schools are charged.

The worth, then, of any school system can probably never be ascertained through theoretical discussion of the relative merits of various schemes and theories of organization and procedure. There would seem to be but one final reliable criterion—results. What outcomes are achieved? Does one method and practice secure better conditions than another?

One need not, for purposes of this study, consider the problem of ultimate values. To do so would carry the discussion into the farthest reaches of philosophy. Correctly or incorrectly, some values must be assumed. First, one must believe that education is worth while. If it is bad, then it may well be maintained that the less of it the better; and the less efficiently agencies function that propagate it, the greater the gain for humanity. In such a case, poor teachers, a short school year, deficient support, disorganization, and demoralized administration would be blessings. But such can hardly be maintained if one believes in the fundamental conceptions of democracy. In any consideration of American educational practice, the worth of education may be assumed. There may be disagreement as to its essence, but, once having admitted the value of educational effort through publicly supported institutions, there seem to be certain corollaries which must be admitted. If education be valuable, its getting is worth while. This result seems to be achieved more surely with increased attendance upon the schools, for longer periods, under proper physical conditions, with more skillful teachers, and under the guidance and direction of thoroughly tested, scientific pedagogical conceptions. The advisory committee which assisted in shaping the 1919 school law of New Hampshire summarizes it in speaking of "instruction by competent teachers, under expert supervision, in wholesome school buildings and for full school years." It seems defensible to say that the type of organization, administration, and support which most surely, efficiently, and economically secures these and comparable results is the best.

In attempting to evaluate the various theories and practices in organization, administration, and support in the history of public education in New Hampshire, it seems proper to use certain comparative outcomes as a criterion. So far as existing school records have permitted, such practice has been attempted in many of the foregoing pages of this study. And in attempting to estimate the worth of the type of organization, administration, and support achieved as a result of the school law of 1919, this method of judging by certain comparative results seems valuable and fair.

It is hardly necessary to point out here that dangers accompany such a practice. It is always unsafe to compare conditions in any two periods of time and assume that some single selected factor was the cause of any or all differences existing. Innumerable causal factors are always at work, and any one or any combination of them may account for these different outcomes. It would be ridiculous to suppose that the coming of electric lights to New Hampshire school buildings in place of candles was exclusively caused by abandonment of the district system. But existence of this danger in the method of comparing outcomes of different practices in different periods does not necessarily invalidate it. If it can be shown beyond reasonable doubt that certain changes in the phenomena of two periods accompany or succeed certain changes in causal factors, then one may assume a definite relationship to exist between them. This is, of course, increasingly possible to the extent that all possible causal factors can be controlled and any one or combination be permitted to function.

It would seem that this method is safely applicable in attempting to evaluate the results of the New Hampshire school law of 1919.

It is possible to contrast certain outcomes of educational organization and administration for the years 1919, 1918, and so forth—the years immediately preceding the changes under the 1919 law—with comparable outcomes in the years immediately following the new law. In this short period no outstanding changes other than this law occurred in New Hampshire educational regulations. No other important change in social or economic practice which greatly affected education can be noted. Aside from the adjustments succeeding the World War, these years are not more unlike than are any other usual series of succeeding years. Indeed, it would not seem unfair to say that the war zeal preceding 1919 raised the educational work of the state for that period to an unusual level of excellence. If rather outstanding changes can be shown to have occurred in educational attainment, and if these can be exhibited as desirable modifications as measured by generally accepted American educational standards, then it seems but fair to credit the system of organization, administration, and support which the 1919 law established with certain inherent values in the field of educational practice.

In the following pages is attempted such a comparison. It is unfortunate that the limitations of this study do not permit a full presentation of all available data. The exhibition of materials which are truly representative will be attempted, however. It is hoped, moreover, to treat those aspects of educational activity which are most strategic and fraught with greatest significance in the struggle of a people to maintain an effective system of public education. More than this cannot be attempted in this connection.

It is not necessary here to review the shortcomings in New Hampshire educational practice and attainment which brought the new system into being. This has been presented in the preceding chapter. "The specific purpose of the new school law was through state aid, administrative and financial, to make possible full education for all New Hampshire children whether they live in poor or rich towns."[1] This result had not been attained under the previous system. And one of the chief causes of shortcomings had been inequality in the length of the school year. The poor towns, although taxing themselves heavily, were unable to provide schools on an equality with the wealthier places. It is well to note, then, what results were secured in solving the state's problem of

---

[1] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1923-1924, p. 25.

1. EQUALIZING AND EXTENDING THE SCHOOL YEAR

Until the present Educational Act was passed, there was no minimum legal school year. The minimum set for state school aid was thirty weeks, and, in the minds of many, this became a minimum standard to be obtained.

In spite of this, 36 of the 256 districts failed, either through financial inability or through lack of educational interest, to provide even thirty weeks of school. During the year (1917-1918), 161 districts furnished less than thirty-six weeks and 92 districts thirty-six weeks or more.[2]

The 1919 Law did not temporize in the situation. It commanded that,

> The school board of every district shall provide standard elementary schools for at least thirty-six weeks in each year. (Sec. 20.)

And that there should be no misunderstanding of the term "standard school" the law specifically defined it. It says that,

> A standard school as that term is used in this act is one (1) maintained for at least thirty-six weeks in each year, (2) in a suitable and sanitary building, (3) equipped with approved furniture, books, maps and other necessary appliances, (4) taught by an approved teacher, (5) directed and supervised by an approved superintendent, (6) with suitable provision for the care of the health and physical welfare of all pupils. (Sec. 24.)

This provision of the new law for a uniform school year for rural and city children was looked upon by many as chimerical and impossible of attainment. In 1919, 924 schools had been open for but twenty to thirty-four weeks, and 161 towns had a shortened school year. What the 1919 Law's provisions for financial and administrative assistance did is best shown by the following table.[3] It shows the gain in weeks for all schools of the state for 1919-1920, the first year of the new law's operation.

1 school gained 16 weeks
6 schools gained 13 weeks
9 schools gained 12 weeks
1 school gained 11 weeks
7 schools gained 9 weeks
15 schools gained 8 weeks
32 schools gained 7 weeks
158 schools gained 6 weeks
78 schools gained 5 weeks

---

[2] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 84.

[3] *Ibid.,* 1919-1920, p. 86.

117	schools gained	4 weeks
223	schools gained	3 weeks
123	schools gained	2 weeks
154	schools gained	1 week
1,096	schools	No gain

These 1,096 schools were almost without exception in districts where 36 weeks have been given for years. The table shows that the children in 433 schools—and these were almost all one-room country schools—had at least one month more schooling this year because of the new law. Restated in terms of children, this means that 6,495 children—all from rural homes in agricultural communities—had last year at least one month more of schooling than has ever been given in their districts before. . . . This year only 11 schools with 123 pupils had 30 weeks or less, while in 1917-1918 there were 163 such schools with 2,455 pupils.

Here is shown the immediate, first-year effect of the new law's provisions. However, it is only when one considers the accomplishments of the entire period up to 1926 (the latest statistics) that the merits of the new organization are really shown. In the following table is given the average length of the school year in all districts of the state for a period of years.[4]

AVERAGE LENGTH OF SCHOOL YEAR IN ALL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE FOR A PERIOD OF YEARS

YEAR	LENGTH	YEAR	LENGTH
1881-82	19.25 weeks	1917-18	34.48 weeks
1886-87	22.39 weeks	1919	35.82 weeks
1891-92	24.32 weeks	1920	36.36 weeks
1896-97	26.91 weeks	1921	36.01 weeks
1901-02	28.01 weeks	1922	36.33 weeks
1906-07	28.01 weeks	1923	36.44 weeks
1911-12	33.80 weeks	1924	36.40 weeks
1913-14	34.11 weeks	1925	36.37 weeks
1915-16	34.43 weeks	1926	36.55 weeks

This record of seven years shows that not once since the new organization went into operation has the average school year for all the districts dropped below the required thirty-six weeks. Indeed, the last year reported is the best. New Hampshire has found that farm children can be spared from house duties, that her roads are not impassable, and that "no New Hampshire winter is too severe for New Hampshire children."

---

[4] Compiled from *New Hampshire State Board of Education Reports.*

Averages are not, however, always reliable. The extra good allow the very poor to pass unnoticed when averaged. What has happened in New Hampshire's *poorest* schools? One may learn of this by considering the following table[5] which tells how many of the state's public schools have had a shortened school year.

SCHOOLS WITH A SHORTENED SCHOOL YEAR

YEAR	NO. OF SCHOOLS WITH SHORTENED YEAR
1919	924
1920	112
1921	30
1922	15
1923	12
1924	9
1925	20
1926	0

Surely this table records a genuine and notable accomplishment in educational administration. The immediate effect of the new law must challenge attention and approval. And the inherent value of the administrative system which it established is revealed in the consistent improvement from year to year. The loss in 1925 was due to an outbreak of scarlet fever in the state, but the record for 1926 would seem to justify any appearance of boasting in the comment of the *State Report of the Board of Education* when it says:[6]

> We doubt that there is another state in the Union that can boast that for 1925-26 every child in the state had for him a school kept open for the full thirty-six weeks. The result has been reached by careful plans of efficient school boards. Transportation has been made satisfactory, schoolhouses have been made comfortable and the school year has been arranged to avoid the most inclement weeks. Even more than this, the gain has come from the selection of competent teachers. When pupils and parents have confidence in the ability and character of their teachers, there is a good school attendance.

Surely the unprejudiced observer, studying these and other possible comparisons of school year conditions in New Hampshire, must be convinced that the state has succeeded, through the new system of administration and state-aid support of schools in the less fortunate parts of the territory in eliminating one great cause of deficient education. The story which these school statistics tell is not a story of fortuity or coincidence. It is a consistent narrative covering eight years. It requires something more than aspiration and idealism to bring to pass a condition in which every child, in every school, of every district in every union in New Hampshire's wooded, snow-heaped countryside has a possible full standard school session of thirty-six weeks. It requires idealism and aspiration—yes! But to these must be added proper organization, a competent system of administration, and an equitable and productive fiscal policy. If results are a safe criterion, one must believe that New Hampshire has such a system under the law of 1919.

---

[5] Compiled from *New Hampshire State Board of Education Reports.*

[6] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1925-1926, p. 102.

An available school, however, no matter how good, will not educate children unless they are in attendance upon it. The purpose of a school system is to educate pupils and not just to "conduct" schools. One may well ask, then, whether the system of administration and support inaugurated by the 1919 law has succeeded in bringing the children into the schools—what has been the effect upon.

2. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

It is reasonable to suppose, and the records show, that the increase in the school year has occurred for the most part in the schools of the poorest, least available, and most retarded parts of the state. In such districts would be some families of lower ideals and less interested in having their children in school. There would be poorer roads, making attendance in bad weather difficult. In such parts of the state would be poor sanitary and health conditions, keeping children from school through disease. Indeed, the new system of organization and support had added to the school year almost exclusively in those regions where one might expect poorer attendance conditions. It might be expected that this, although making more schooling available, would actually reduce sharply the percentage of attendance when averaged for the whole state. Even had it done so, it would not necessarily have reflected discredit upon the new system. True, the 1919 Law had not changed legal provisions for school attendance. The law had previously provided that,

> All children must attend a public or an approved private school every day that the school is in session from their eighth to sixteenth birthday, or to their fourteenth birthday if they have then completed the eighth grade. There is no excuse, except physical or mental incompetence. Neither poverty of parents nor isolation of the home may stand in the way. . . .[7]

But, the new law's insistence upon thirty-six weeks of schooling for every child in the state, especially in the backward, less progressive communities, had surely increased possibility of increased inattendance in spite of the law. Possibility, perhaps, but not *necessity* of inattendance! For the records show that the per cent of attendance for the whole state has actually increased. The following table[8] shows such per cent of attendance of the entire day school enrollment for a series of years.

YEAR	PER CENT OF ENROLLMENT ATTENDING
1917-18	91.60
1919-20	91.60
1920-21	93.18
1921-22	93.11
1922-23	93.46
1923-24	93.90
1924-25	94.24
1925-26	94.63

Surely it is sufficient comment to note that in the most recent year, when every school in the state was available thirty-six weeks or more, the per cent of attendance was the highest it has ever been. The present New Hampshire system not only provides schooling for pupils, but it brings them to it.

3. SCHOOLHOUSES

It was noted in discussion of the district period of school organization in New Hampshire, that poor school buildings were a constant source of low educational attainment and ill health in pupils. Conditions had, of course, improved in the passing years, but,

> For many years there were no general laws which dealt with school buildings, and the matter was wholly left with the local school authorities.

---

[7] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1925-1926, p. 81.

[8] Compiled from *New Hampshire State Board of Education Reports*.

The first laws on the subject dealt only with the neighborhood of the school. There should be no barbed-wire fence continguous to the school plot (P. S. 143:31) and no slaughter house, tan yard or saloon in the immediate neighborhood of the school (P. S. 108:15 and 95:9).

The next step in legal enactment called attention closer to the school itself, though it dealt only with the exits from school. Doors must open outward and buildings must be provided with fire escapes (P. S. 1915:123). Finally, in 1915, came the first laws which gave the state authority to safeguard the public school meeting places of the children of the state, and it was provided that on complaint a schoolhouse that "is in any respect a menace, or likely to become a menace, to the health or bodily welfare of the pupils or teachers" may be condemned by the State Board of Health, and in this case changes must forthwith be made (P. S. 1915:35).

The law of 1919 goes a step farther in that it declares that every elementary school shall be a standard school "in a suitable and sanitary building."[9]

The following extract from the 1923-1924 *Report* of the State Board of Education (p. 33) shows that New Hampshire succeeded, under the provisions of the 1919 Law, in improving very appreciably the condition in the state's schoolhouses.

> In six years most districts have met, by a progressive system of remodeling, reasonable standards of school comfort and sanitation. The majority of the buildings used now are properly lighted, heated and cared for and made decently attractive within and without. During this period 45 new buildings have been erected and 420 have been completely or largely remodeled.
>
> Estimated gain in six years:

	1919	1924
Superior buildings	100	275
Good buildings	200	440
Fair buildings	300	310
Unsuitable buildings	500	75

In the *Rules and Regulations* of the State Board of Education of October 2, 1922, it is provided that local school boards must "maintain all school houses in a clean and proper condition."[10] Under section sixteen of the same *Rules and Regulations,* the state board specifies conditions which must prevail in schoolhouses as to lighting, window space, heating, ventilation, floors, walls, toilet facilities, drinking water, and other sanitary and health conditions. It is the duty of the local boards, under the law, to see that these specifications are obeyed.

---

[9] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 90.

[10] *Ibid.,* 1921-1922, p. 35.

In commenting on the accomplishments of the state in improving schoolhouse conditions in the first two years of operation under the 1919 Law, the *State Report* says:[11]

> This progress could not have been made, if we had not had state-wide supervision. Except by overloading the office with a considerable number of inspectors, it would have been impossible to determine the condition in the schools throughout the state. As it is, a survey has been made of every building and a careful description of it filed at the office.
>
> Without the help of superintendents, the school boards of many towns would have been unable to formulate proper plans for reconstruction and to carry them to successful accomplishment. The continuation of this policy means that within a few years the school houses throughout the state while neither ornate nor expensive will be safe and suitable for the care of young people and for their instruction.

The large and state-wide administrative powers and financial assistance which were provided by the organization under the 1919 Law have evidently made a "suitable and sanitary building" the school home of practically every pupil in New Hampshire.

4. HEALTH AND SANITATION

Closely allied to the problem of schoolhouses is that of health and sanitation provisions for school pupils. It has been noted that one of the requirements for a standard elementary school under the 1919 Law is "suitable provision for the care of the health and physical welfare of all pupils."[12]

> For many years, in the public mind, the sole purpose of schools was to impart information and to inculcate habits of obedience. The health and bodily welfare of children received little attention, except so far as the enlightened school boards made provision for the schools under their charge. There was no general law or regulation in the matter.

Provisions[13] had been passed for teaching to children "the effects of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics upon the human system," and the law required vaccination of all school children as a preventive of smallpox epidemic. Chapter VII noted, also, a law in 1901 excluding from school all pupils afflicted with any infectious disease. Reference was made, too, to a general law passed in 1913 providing for medical inspection in the schools. It was not, however, compulsory, but was optional with the districts.

---

[11] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1919-1920, p. 93.

[12] *Ibid.*, 1919-1920, p. 94.

[13] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 37, Session Laws of 1883, and others.

> It was adopted in a considerable number of towns and cities and its operation brought results of varying value.
>
> In some districts the law although adopted was ignored, and in others it received but perfunctory attention. In another class of districts it was so efficiently administered that notable results were soon seen.[14]

In the 1919 Law the health of public school pupils is approached as a matter of school administration and not of public health. Section 30 provides that state funds are to be used,

> For promotion of the physical health and recreation of pupils, and for their medical and dental examination.
>
> For the determination of mental and physical defects, for the employment of school nurses and the instruction of pupils in the principles of health and sanitation.

In order to provide administrative machinery to make the health provisions operative, the law further provided that the state board

> May employ a competent person or persons to examine and care for the health of pupils, but this section shall not in any way contravene section 8, Chapter 83 of the Laws of 1913, relative to the right of any parent or guardian to protest in writing against the examination of his or her child or ward for or on account of any non-contagious disease or defect.

In accordance with the provisions of the law, the state board has employed a school supervisor of health and has made regulations for health and physical welfare of pupils in the entire state. In part these rules provide that,

> All districts which have adopted medical inspection in accordance with the law shall comply with the provisions of the law.
>
> In all other districts, there shall be employed, as the school board may direct, a school physician or a school nurse or school nurses, who shall make not less than one annual examination of pupils, note and record their physical condition, together with diseases and defects, including dental defects, notify teachers and parents and with the aid of teachers and superintendents labor to secure remedial treatment when necessary, provided, however, in districts where the school physician and nurses are under the control of the local board of health, such control shall be exercised by said board. All tests shall be made as the law provides and all reports made upon prescribed forms.[15]

---

[14] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1919-1920, p. 95.

[15] *Ibid.*, 1921-1922, p. 46.

This was the health provision and administrative equipment established by the school Law of 1919. At the end of the first year of its operation the *State Report* says,

> During the first year this health supervision has been arranged for 98 per cent of the public school children of the state. Under the old law only about 30 per cent of these children were reached by medical inspection.[16]

At the end of six years of the law's operation the state board of education says in its report:[17]

> In 1919 medical inspection was optional with each district and had been adopted by most of the rich districts. In 1924, by the aid of doctors and nurses, the advantages of medical inspection were extended to all districts.

Thus it would seem that the type of school organization, administration, and financial support provided for New Hampshire under the Law of 1919 has not only succeeded in creating a state-wide school year of thirty-six weeks with a high per cent of pupil attendance at schools conducted in sanitary and suitable schoolhouses, but also has made state-wide provision for the maintenance of such health conditions in pupils that constant school attendance and fruitful school efforts are possible. Local ignorance and prejudice no longer have full opportunity to rob school children of the benefits of the scientific achievements of their race.

5. TEACHERS

> The essentials for a successful school are a teaching teacher and a learning pupil. There are many accessories. Some of these are necessary and many of them desirable, but these are the two essentials.[18]

The provision of a state-wide standard school year, high per cent of pupil attendance, suitable and sanitary schoolhouses and proper health conditions was New Hampshire's attempt to provide a constant, present, and competent learning pupil. That rather outstanding improvement in all these regards had resulted from the provisions of the 1919 Law, the preceding pages seem to prove. But these alone do not insure educational attainment. The pupils must have the assistance of "a teaching teacher." This fact the state had specifically recognized in specifying that a standard elementary school must be "taught by an approved teacher."

---

[16] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 89.

[17] *Ibid.,* 1923-1924, p. 33.

[18] *Ibid.,* 1925-1926, p. 97.

> The State of New Hampshire assumed no responsibility for the quality of the teaching in its elementary schools and did not make the most elementary requirements in regard to either the intelligence or to the character of teachers within its schools until the passage of the Act of 1919. Not even an examination nor any formal certification was specified as necessary. The various local school boards were left entirely free to erect their own standards and in many cases had no knowledge of what modern standards were.
>
> Under this system it was inevitable that the teaching standards of the respective districts should vary greatly and that the abilities and qualifications of teachers in the various groups should vary as widely as the standards. Such a system not only did not deny, but in certain cases actually permitted, teachers ignorant or immoral to obtain places in our schools. Moreover, when places had been secured the absence of specified standards made it difficult to dislodge teachers.[19]

All this was changed by the 1919 Law's provisions. For the first time in the history of New Hampshire, genuine state certification of public school teachers became a fact. The new law forsook the practice of nearly three hundred years when it took from the hands of local school boards power to determine teacher qualification and provided that,

> The state board shall prescribe the qualifications and duties of . . teachers employed in the public schools. (Sec. 5.)

Further, it is stipulated that,

> Superintendents shall nominate and school boards elect all teachers employed in the schools in their union.

In no case, however, could a teacher be employed whose qualifications had not met the approval of the State Board of Education. These necessary qualifications were established in the *Rules and Regulations* of the State Board of Education[20] adopted May 8, 1919. In part these specify that,

> Superintendents may nominate only teachers holding a New Hampshire certificate, license or permit. . . . All teachers, except substitutes, must be employed under a written contract.

The rules then set high standards of academic and professional training and teaching experience as qualifications for securing an

[19] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 107.

[20] *Ibid.,* 1919-1920, p. 63.

elementary grade teacher's certificate. Provision is made for granting one-year licenses and one-year permits, it being specified that,

> To meet special needs for teachers not able to secure certificates or licenses, the Commissioner may grant on proper recommendation permits good for not to exceed one year.

The degree to which certification under the new law became a state-wide function and power to grant certificates became centralized may be seen in the state board ruling that,

> All certificates, licenses and permits are revocable by the Commissioner of Education, and for reasons satisfactory to the Commissioner may be denied by him.

Whether the centralization movement in the matter of teacher certification has resulted in good for the public schools in New Hampshire can to some extent be established by comparing the periods before and since the 1919 Law. True, previous to that time there were no state-wide standards and so it is somewhat difficult to make completely valid comparisons. From the state records, however, the following table was computed for the 1923-1924 *State Report* (p. 30).

PROGRESS MADE IN SIX YEARS

	1919, PER CENT	1924, PER CENT
Trained	31.9	63.0
Partly trained	33.7	30.8
Untrained	34.4	6.2

The following table taken from the 1925-1926 *State Report* (p. 62) shows what has been accomplished in eight years.

PROGRESS MADE IN EIGHT YEARS

	1919	1926	CHANGE
New Hampshire normal graduates.	576	1,208	632
Other normal graduates	234	276	42
College graduates	459	542	83
Partial course—college or normal ..	399	733	334
No training or post-secondary	875	125	750

> Three items in this table are encouraging. In this period we have gained 674 Normal school graduates. We have increased the number of those who have a short normal school course, or one to three years at college, by 334. By this increase in normal graduates, we have been able to reduce the number of teachers with no training or post-secondary education by 750 and for this year 42 per cent of all teachers in the public schools are New Hampshire normal school graduates.[21]

Naturally, in a matter such as teacher qualification sudden changes cannot be made. The schools must be taught and available teachers must be employed. The criterion of the success of a system would seem to be its power to bring high standards ultimately to prevail. The following extracts from the 1925-1926 *State Report* may give some measure of the rate and degree of improvement wrought by the 1919 Law and the consequent educational system.

> . . . In two years the number of wholly untrained rural teachers has been reduced from 115 to 84; of village elementary from 59 to 41; of city elementary from 61 to 60 and of high school teachers from 343 to 263. . . . Two years ago we had 937 teachers with six weeks or less of training. Now we have but 753.[22]
>
> In the fall of 1925 there were 142 vacancies in one-room rural schools which needed to be filled by inexperienced teachers. Of these, 101 were filled by regular graduates of the state normal schools; 12 by graduates of other normal or training schools; 4 by college students or graduates; and 25 by high school graduates who had completed the first of four summer sessions of normal school study. State aid makes possible for rural schools reasonable salaries and we can now promise any rural school a graduated teacher, if it can provide a boarding place suitable for a young woman.[23]

It would seem that the provision for state certification of teachers has already resulted in a highly improved condition over that which prevailed before 1919. But the most encouraging part of the new program which puts the matter of teaching standards into the hands of a centralized and expert power is that it makes possible a plan for continued systematic improvement. It adds professional vision. Says the 1923-1924 *State Report* (p. 102):

> It is very certain that we can progress little farther with general education in the state until we can have more trained teachers and better trained teachers for all schools.

[21] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1925-1926, p. 63.

[22] *Ibid.,* 1925-1926, p. 57.

[23] *Ibid.,* 1925-1926, p. 98.

Therefore, we should make this our aim: *We must have by 1932 a trained teacher in every New Hampshire public school.* By the term "trained teacher," we mean one who has had two or more years of post-secondary study, including at least thirty semester hours of professional or methods courses and not less than twelve weeks of practice teaching under the daily supervision of critic teachers employed in a training school, except that teachers of not less than five years' experience may offer equivalency by summer or correspondence courses.

This vision of the State Department of Education seems not altogether unfounded in fact, when one considers what is being done to train more teachers in New Hampshire. This can be shown no better than in the statistics of attendance upon the normal schools of the state. The following table shows this for a series of years.

STATISTICS OF ATTENDANCE UPON THE NORMAL SCHOOLS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

YEAR	NO. OF STUDENTS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE NORMALS
1918	240
1919	290
1920	342
1921	357
1922	466
1923	635
1924	740
1925	765
1926	854

To this record of increased attendance upon the regular year of the teacher-training institutions may be added the fact that summer school attendance which was 188 in 1919 had mounted to 428 in 1926. Evidence of the relationship between the centralized system of control and the problem of teacher training is shown in a statement from the 1925-1926 *State Report* of the State Department of Education.

> Our New Hampshire system is so compact that we can determine with reasonable accuracy . . . the annual overturn, not only as a total but in the several divisions of instruction. We know about how many kindergartners, music supervisors, teachers of high school Latin, etc., we need. Strict state economy means that we prepare for each division sufficient teachers but no large surplus. This is our plan.

It is now sixty years since New Hampshire took the first hesitant step to establish a teacher-training institution to be "maintained without expense to the state, except the necessary expenses of the trustees." In the year 1925-1926,[24] $136,529.18 was spent in operation of the two normal schools for the regular session. One cannot doubt that the people of the state are supporting wholeheartedly the efforts to give every child in every district a fully trained teacher, nor that the centralized system of certification established by the 1919 Law is bringing pressure that will eventually force every untrained teacher from the schools to make room for those who have secured professional training.

Closely allied to this problem of a trained teaching force for the schools of the state is that of permanence of the staff. Teacher changes within the year mean broken schools and a poor year's work for the pupils. The following table shows what has been accomplished in reducing this practice since 1919.

TEACHER CHANGES WITHIN THE YEAR SINCE 1919

YEAR	MID-YEAR CHANGES
1919	540
1920	362
1921	231
1922	204
1923	187
1924	165
1925	109
1926	118

> This has been done by yearly contracts and by elimination of incompetent and conscienceless teachers who for years moved from district to district.[25]

The 1919 Law declared that a standard elementary school must be "taught by an approved teacher." It specified further that such approval must come from a centralized state power. This power was given full authority to set the terms under which approval would be given. For eight years the plan has been used, and the only right the local districts seem to have lost is that of employing a poorly trained teacher. And surely results show that even the most rabid type of praiseworthy New Hampshire "localism" must admit that this is a loss which is truly a gain.

---

[24] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1925-1926, p. 140.

[25] *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 31.

6. SUPERVISION

Repeatedly in this study of New Hampshire's educational history have been noted attempts and devices to secure supervision of the work of the schools. The district system had followed out its policy of localism, and by means of the superintending school committee had attempted to secure fruitful supervision through the services of selected laymen. It was "localism's" traditional faith in the power of the people of a small community to operate their own institutions successfully. It practically denied the professional character of the educator. The possession of such character and attainments as would poll a majority vote of one's neighbors was supposed to fit one for the work of supervising the work of the local educational institutions. It should not be thought that there was unanimous acceptance of this conception, however. Even in the first half of the nineteenth century there were those who were agitating for professional direction of the schools. The idea was not popular with "localism."

> The belief in the necessity of expert supervision for all schools in New Hampshire has been one of slow acceptance. The first step was made in 1855 when the city of Manchester employed a superintendent of schools. This example was followed in other cities of the state as follows:
>
> Nashua, 1869; Concord, 1874; Dover, 1881; Portsmouth, 1885; Keene, 1889; Laconia and Rochester, 1894; Somersworth, 1897.
>
> These superintendents supervised the schools of the cities only, as the law did not permit the union of districts for the employment of an expert superintendent. The advantages of supervision were so apparent that in 1899 the legislature passed the first law which made it permissible for districts to unite for this purpose.
>
> As soon as possible, three unions were formed, the first three in the school history of the state. . . .
>
> Year by year additional districts voted to unite for supervision and the progress of the acceptance of professional supervision is shown in the table which follows where is given the percentage of school membership under supervision for each year, beginning with 1892.
>
> The law of 1899 was, therefore, operative for twenty years and by the union of districts gave the advantages of expert supervision to about 60 per cent of the school children in the state. This is in addition to the 23 per cent of school children who resided in cities that before this had adopted supervision.[26]

---

[26] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 100.

YEAR	PER CENT
1892	23
1893	26
1894	28
1895	28
1896	29
1897	31
1898	32
1899	31
1900	33
1901	35
1902	35
1903	37
1904	42
1905	48
1906	57
1907	62
1908	63
1909	64
1910	67
1911	72
1912	72
1913	75
1914	77
1915	75
1916	80
1917	81
1918	84
1919	100

Thus it is plain that the idea of professional supervision had a strong hold on the people of New Hampshire previous to the passage of the 1919 legislation. However, the conditions under which it was administered under the law of 1899 left some very serious defects in the system as it prevailed. One can better understand the motives of the 1919 Law as concerns supervision, if he reads a somewhat extended extract from the 1919-1920 *State Report*[27] which discusses the shortcomings of the 1899 law.

> The three chief defects of the bill related to financial, administrative and personal features. Its financial defect was that it placed upon towns of small population, scattered homes and low valuation a financial burden which prevented its adoption, even though the district greatly desired improved schools. . . .
>
> In 1919 there were 112 of the 256 districts which because of geographical or financial reasons had not been able to make provision for the supervision of their schools.
>
> The law of 1899 was defective in that it did not clearly outline the duties of the superintendent. He was not a state officer and in his work had only such power and such responsibility as had been given him by the school boards in the different districts which formed his union. This prevented any unity of work and in many instances made impossible the efficient administration of schools.
>
> An additional defect had to do with the personnel of the supervisory force. The law so placed the choice of superintendents that incompetent men could be employed. The law provided no way by which unqualified superintendents could be dismissed from the profession. The result was

---

[27] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 102.

that although the majority of the superintendents were highly competent there were at all times a few superintendents in service in the state whose work and whose personality tended to discredit supervision.

With all the defects of the prevailing system, however, professional supervision had won its way, and when the 1919 legislature undertook educational reorganization "it was clearly seen that professional supervision was the cornerstone of the educational structure which was to be erected." The new law made prescription that every elementary school in the state must be a "standard elementary school" and then that every such school must be "directed and supervised by an approved superintendent." (Sec. 24). Provision was thus made for compulsory, universal, professional supervision. And, in order that there should be an end to the employment of incompetent superintendents, it was provided that,

> The state board shall prescribe the qualifications and duties . . . of all superintendents and assistant superintendents. . . . (Sec. 5.)

Nor was this all. The determination of the state to overcome some of the evils of "localism" in education and to put a strong central hand upon the whole business of supervision was shown farther in a provision that,

> Upon consultation with the local school boards in each of the said supervisory unions and upon the nomination by said school boards of a suitable and competent person, the state board shall employ such person as superintendent. The state board may employ by the same method one or more assistant superintendents when that is reasonably necessary, and may remove a superintendent or assistant superintendent when the interests of the schools require it. (Sec. 9.)
>
> The state board shall fix the salary or salaries of the superintendent and assistant superintendents for the supervisory unions, but any union may add such sum as it sees fit to the salary of the superintendent or assistant superintendent as fixed by the state board, and in that event the treasurer of the union shall pay one-half of such excess salary or salaries into the state treasury. . . . Upon the sworn statement of the commissioner of education the salaries of all superintendents and assistant superintendents as thus fixed and determined shall be paid by the state treasurer monthly upon the warrant of the governor and council.

Through these provisions the local union superintendents became employees of the state, receiving their salaries from the state treasurer, and having their duties and qualifications prescribed by a state law and a state board of education. Surely New Hampshire may be said to have a state system of school supervision. The work of every child comes under the immediate direction of a professional state school employee. "Twice during the year all superintendents are gathered for extended conferences with the state board upon the details of the administration of educational policies. In this way, difficulties can be met and unity of administration secured." [28]

In accordance with the powers given it, the state board has ruled that,[29]

> The joint committees of supervisory unions may nominate only superintendents and assistant superintendents holding a New Hampshire supervisory certificate.

To secure this certificate, one must be a graduate "in full from a registered college granting the bachelors degree" and have had "at least five years' successful experience in teaching." It is provided, moreover, that,

> All supervisory certificates are revocable by the Commissioner, with the approval of the State Board of Education.[30]

With this legal provision for school supervision, New Hampshire proceeded to reorganize her supervisory system.

> At the time of the passage of the law, 144 districts in the state were grouped into 45 unions and 112 districts, widely scattered, were without supervision. These unsupervised districts were so located that had they been combined into additional unions at least 37 new unions would have been needed. With the assistant superintendents required for the cities, there would of necessity have been in this case 87 superintendents employed in place of the 69 now in service. Since the average salary of the superintendent is about three thousand dollars, the expense of supervision, if the old plan had been carried to completion, would have been fifty-four thousand dollars per year more than is now the case.
>
> With the new law, a complete redistricting was possible and we were enabled to join together contiguous towns which would permit the superintendent to do his duties without the expense of time and money which unnecessary travel produces.[31]

The state is now (1926) divided into sixty-three supervisory unions and employs sixty-seven superintendents.

[28] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 103.

[29] *Ibid.,* 1921-1922, p. 37.

[30] *Ibid.,* 1921-1922, p. 39.

[31] *Ibid.,* 1919-1920, p. 103.

> These unions vary in composition from a city district to unions composed of eight adjacent town school districts. Supervision of public schools is now common in most American states but in many the supervisory divisions are coterminous with county lines and superintendents are chosen at public elections with other county officials. The result in these states is frequently a superintendent without professional training who is called upon to supervise so many schools that but one or two visits a year are possible and supervision becomes a mere inspection. This is not the New Hampshire plan. The superintendents have under their direction but thirty to fifty teachers and close supervision results.[32]

This claim of the New Hampshire Board is borne out by the statistics, it seems, for

> In 1919 each unsupervised school averaged from members of school boards two visits.
>
> In 1924 all public schools were supervised and each averaged from its superintendent twenty-one visits and from the school board two visits.[33]

It cannot be said that the 1919 Law brought effective supervision to all New Hampshire schools for the first time. Many, as is shown in previous pages, had excellent supervision previous to 1919. The great service of the new organization was in bringing supervision to the poor districts of the state.

> Under the 1899 law so large a portion of the superintendent's salary was paid by the local districts that the salaries of superintendents in unions composed of rural districts was small, in comparison with the compensation offered in unions composed of larger and wealthier towns. This meant that new superintendents would begin their work in the towns of small population and with increased experience would be under strong temptation to move as often as opportunity came to new and larger positions. The result of this was that many superintendents remained in their union not long enough to reach a maximum of efficiency and the poorest towns, those where supervision was most necessary, were constantly served by the least experienced and matured superintendents.[34]

The legislature of 1921 reduced[35] the proportion of superintendent's salary paid by the state, making provision that all above $2,000 must be paid by the union. Previously one-half above $2,000 had been paid in addition to the $2,000. However, in spite of this reduction in state aid the total payroll of the superintendents of the state has steadily advanced. The following table shows this increase.[36]

---

[32] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1921-1922, p. 73.

[33] *Ibid.*, 1923-1924, p. 32.

[34] *Ibid.*, 1919-1920, p. 105.

[35] *Laws of New Hampshire*, Chap. 125, Session Laws of 1921.

ADVANCE OF TOTAL PAYROLL OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE STATE

YEAR	TOTAL PAYROLL
1920-1921	$208,083.33
1921-1922	210,220.00
1922-1923	213,370.00
1923-1924	221,590.00
1924-1925	228,040.00
1925-1926	232,670.00
1926-1927	238,800.00

For the year 1921-1922, the average salary was $3,091.47. For the year 1926-1927, it was $3,481.81, exclusive of Manchester. The salary range is from $2,500 to $9,000 per year.

The degree of permanence in the supervisory staff of the state is indicated by the following table.[37]

DEGREE OF PERMANENCE IN SUPERVISORY STAFF

	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
Transfers	1	5	1	5	0
New superintendents ...	6	7	2	7	3
Superintendents returned	0	0	0	1	1

It is not permissible that further data be added or discussion be lengthened in the matter of school supervision. Viewed from almost any angle, the Law of 1919, placing the supervision of New Hampshire schools in the hands of a state-employed, certified and directed staff of professional school superintendents, seems to have resulted in improved conditions. This is true especially in the poor districts. It has been noted that the population movement which took children and economic support from many New Hampshire towns left them helpless, unless assistance, financial and professional, came from without. The 1919 Law brought each of these—state aid and supervision. Here was the final step in bringing the "standard elementary school" which the new law prescribed as necessary. A genuine and effective effort has been made, and, so far as the economic and intellectual resources of the state of New Hampshire are capable of doing it, every child in the state has been given, under the provisions of the school Law of 1919, not only a full thirty-six weeks' school, with high ratio of attendance, in a suitable and sanitary schoolhouse, under healthful conditions, with a competent teacher, but has been given all the benefits and assistance of scientific research and professional knowledge and skill which can come as a result of being "directed and supervised by an approved superintendent."

---

[36] Compiled from *New Hampshire State Board of Education Reports.*

[37] *Ibid.,* 1925-1926, p. 38.

7. Secondary Education

It seems fair to say that the changes in secondary school conditions following the 1919 Law are not comparable with those on the elementary school level. The 1919 Act was more concerned with the elementary situation. In that field far more than in the high school was New Hampshire localism and tradition strong and directive. In Chapter IV it was pointed out that the private academy supplied the greater part of New Hampshire's secondary education until well toward the close of the nineteenth century. The public high school is a new contribution to New Hampshire education. It came in rather free from tradition of local control. As a result, state influence in the secondary field grew more rapidly and without great opposition. The free high school tuition laws to which reference was made in Chapter VI operated in schools which were approved by the state department of education, and, when the 1919 Law was passed, it seemed necessary to refer to the high school situation only in a provision that assigned necessary state funds to the purposes of free high school tuition under the 1909 and earlier laws.

There seems not to have been the same degree of improvement in the high school teaching staff of the state as in the elementary group since 1919. In discussing salary increases of teachers, the 1925-1926 *State Report* says (p. 62) that, "The high school teachers have no more training, education or experience than in 1919." This is probably due to the fact that the pre-1919 period had higher relative standards for secondary teachers than for elementary instructors. The state's demands through the power of approval had enforced higher standards.

The secondary schools, however, came under the control of the state board with all the other public subcollegiate institutions, and have been administered through the state office. That the high school has overcome the academy tradition and has become an integral part of the public school system seems to be proved by the following table of high school attendance.[38]

TABLE OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

YEAR	ENROLLMENT	PER CENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1915-1916	10,535	95
1916-1917	11,218	95
1917-1918	11,817	94
1918-1919	12,089	93
1919-1920	13,055	93
1920-1921	14,328	93
1921-1922	15,559	94
1922-1923	17,023	93.7
1923-1924	16,356	95
1924-1925	17,321	95.5
1925-1926	18,125	95.2

> The laws require the approval of secondary schools by the State Board of Education in order that tuition charges may be made for pupils who reside in towns without high schools. An inspection is made by the high school agent to whom this work is assigned. The inspection is a thorough one, covering administration, organization and instruction, and a copy of the report is forwarded to the superintendent of the school for his use. . . .[39]

This was, however, done before the 1919 Law was passed and is one reason why drastic action was not necessary in regard to the high schools in that statute. There was, though, a deficiency in provision for secondary education as compared with elementary education. The state department is not at all unaware of this fact, as can be seen when it remarks that,

> Our 1919 laws provide state aid for elementary schools only, but an earlier law gives assistance to poorer towns for the high school tuition is paid. This law gives no aid to districts which maintain their own schools but puts a premium on districts which decline to establish schools but prefer to have their children go to schools in other towns.[40]

[38] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1925-1926, p. 110.
[39] *Ibid.*, 1925-1926, p. 103.
[40] *Ibid.*, 1919-1920, p. 176.

The 1925 legislature made the maximum obligation of a district which does not maintain a high school the average cost for the several items of instruction in the approved high schools of the state. For 1924-1925 this was $97.65, and for 1925-1926 it reached $101.98 per capita.

In 1919 the number of pupils of every 100 entering the first grade who finally entered high school was 55. In 1924 this had risen to 72. Of these, 31 graduated from high school in 1919 and 56 in 1924. Of the pupils graduating in 1919, 11 entered post-secondary institutions, and this number had increased to 23 in 1924.

The 1919 Law was not especially directed at the high school situation in New Hampshire, but under the new plan of organization the high schools have surely prospered.

> The whole purpose of our high school tuition law is to give to every child, who lives in a town too small to maintain a high school, a high school opportunity comparable to that of the child who lives in a town where a high school is in operation. The purpose is not to put a financial burden upon the home town and it is intended that strict economy should be used in giving the child his opportunity for education.[41]

Through this plan, secondary instruction in New Hampshire has become an integral part of the state's system of education.

8. AMERICANIZATION AND ILLITERACY

The immediately preceding pages have traced some of the influences of the 1919 Law in producing a standard elementary school system in New Hampshire. Also, it was noted that public secondary education has become the privilege of every one of the state's children. It may be well to consider what has been accomplished in the field of adult education below the collegiate level.

Consideration was given in an earlier chapter to the fact that New Hampshire has had a large influx of immigrants in the last half century. These were absorbed industrially and no serious consideration was given to the problem. The stress of the war, however, revealed a serious social problem, and it was in the investigation of this problem and search for a solution that the whole movement resulting in the 1919 Law had its inception. The governor-elect's advisory committee which considered the situation said in its report that,[42]

---

[41] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1925-1926, p. 117.

[42] *Ibid.*, 1919-1920, p. 19.

There are no compulsory evening schools though according to the census of 1910, 26,783 of the population of the state cannot use the English language to say nothing of our native-born illiterates.

There had been a meritorious effort to overcome this great social handicap of the state previous to the passage of the 1919 Law.

During the year 1918-19, the New Hampshire Committee on Americanization encouraged the establishment of evening schools in places where there was need of the instruction for those unable to speak, read and write the English language and twenty-four schools were established.[43]

The investigation in 1918 soon revealed, however, that no consistent progress could be made without a well-organized attack upon the problem. This conviction took shape in the provision of the 1919 Law that,

> It (the State Board of Education) . . . may make such rules and regulations as may seem desirable to secure the efficient administration of the public schools and the administration of the work of Americanization in teaching English to non-English-speaking adults . . . which is hereby declared to be an essential part of public school education; . . .

The law then made the establishment of evening schools obligatory in towns and cities in which reside or are employed fifteen minors or twenty adults who cannot speak and read the English language understandingly (Secs. 15 and 16). Attendance of such persons is then made compulsory. The effect in bringing educational opportunity to New Hampshire's illiterates is to be seen in the following summary[44] of statistics.

GROWTH OF EVENING SCHOOLS

YEAR	DISTRICTS	ENROLLMENT
1917-1918	10	1,514
1918-1919	21	3,053
1919-1920	35	6,069
1920-1921	30	4,708
1921-1922	22	4,376
1922-1923	17	3,855
1923-1924	17	4,536
1924-1925	13	3,060
1925-1926	14	2,950

---

[43] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1919-1920, p. 150.

[44] Compiled from *New Hampshire State Board of Education Reports.*

Speaking of the reduced enrollment, the state board said in its 1921-1922 *Report* (p. 137),

> The number enrolled in evening schools has decreased, in part through a lagging in the war time interest in Americanization and in larger part through the reduced number of New Hampshire young men and women who are illiterate in English. This diminution has come from the efficiency of evening school instruction in recent years and from the reduced number of immigrants admitted to our state.

Thus it would seem that in spite of the reduced interest in this work, which might be expected to follow the hysteria of the war period, New Hampshire has maintained a consistent policy of training for illiterates, and the 1925-1926 *State Report* of the state board is able to say,

> In our industrial centers the work has now been organized as a regular development of the public schools.

Closely related to the whole problem of illiteracy and Americanization is that of the work of the parochial and other private schools. Since this study is limited to consideration of the development of the state's public school system, little attention can be given here to the problem of these schools. It is a subject worthy of full study itself. It is obvious, however, that in a state having a large immigrant population of French-Canadian, Irish, and southern European stock, the work of the Roman Catholic parochial system is an exceedingly important one. In 1925-1926 the public elementary school enrollment of the state was 59,671, while that of the elementary parochial schools was 21,130, in 473 schools with 480 teachers.

> Prior to the passage of the law (of 1919), the approval of parochial, as well as of other private schools, was left to the determination of the local school boards. By Sec. 26 of the present law, the power of making such approval is exclusively vested in the State Board. This change was cordially agreed upon by the representatives of the Roman Catholic Parochial Schools.[45]

In accordance with this legal power granted to it the state board, on October 15, 1919, made the following ruling:

> Whereas, under existing laws the legal duty of the Board will not be performed unless all children of school age in the State have an oppor-

---

[45] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report,* 1919-1920, p. 153.

tunity to obtain a sound common school education and avail themselves of such opportunity:

> Resolved, that the approval of the Board shall not be given to any private school which does not comply with the following requirements:
>
> 1. Provide instruction and other educational opportunities as nearly equal as may be reasonably possible to those given in the public schools in the same city or town;
> 2. Be maintained for thirty-six weeks in each year, at least five hours a day, and five days in a week, in a sanitary building; . . .

It was provided, also, that equipment, reports, and results must meet with the approval of the state board.

The executive officer of the Diocesan Board is Wilfrid J. Lessard of Manchester. Mr. Lessard has been a member of the State Board of Education since its organization in 1919, thus making a strong official link between the state's public system and large parochial system of schools. It would seem that New Hampshire has made, under the 1919 Law, a very happy, sane, and efficient adjustment in this problem, and that the parochial system has in a real sense become a part of the state's system of education.

9. COST

The comparative worth of different plans of organization and administration of public school systems is revealed, of course, by their respective powers in getting desired results. But this is not all. A correlative criterion is power to get comparable results most economically. When the public is taxing itself to support a system of schools, it insists not only upon desired results, but upon their economical production. It seems proper, then, in concluding this short consideration of educational attainment under the 1919 Law to ask, What has it cost? Is the plan based on sound fiscal principles?

The purpose of this study precludes detailed discussion of many of the financial problems involved in these questions. Some basic and technical principles of economics are involved which are themselves material for long and careful study. There are to be noted here only the general trends in costs which may show whether the organization of 1919 has secured increased educational attainment in a relatively economical way.

Financially, the basic principle of the 1919 Law was that of appropriation of state funds through some form of state taxation for the purchase of educational improvement in certain poor local communities. It was the principle of "state aid." Wealthier communities were to be taxed for more than their local schools cost and the surplus used in the "deficit regions." This principle, as has been shown in a previous chapter, was not new in New Hampshire. The Literary Fund was a form of state aid. It was distributed, however, on the basis of some factor other than relative local need. This was the only money available for state aid until 1899, when the supervisory union was made permissible and aid given. In 1902 the poorer districts were aided in the matter of high school tuition, and in 1909 additional state assistance was given for qualified teachers, average attendance, and supervision.

A fair conception of school costs under the new system may be gained by considering the following financial statistics taken from the reports of the state board.

FINANCIAL STATISTICS TAKEN FROM THE REPORTS OF THE STATE BOARD

YEAR	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	LOCAL TAXATION	COST PER PUPIL
1916........	$2,285,406.37		$37.84
1918........	3,248,708.09		50.71
1919........	3,960,075.67		59.71
1920........	4,228,438.53	3,349,012.71	59.77
1921........	4,787,257.76	3,935,669.40	72.30
1922........	5,189,141.66	4,405,398.25	73.91
1923........	5,718,609.82	4,710,826.58	75.49
1924	6,417,844.88	5,466,642.42	79.25
1925........	6,947,895.69	5,377,643.36	82.55
1926........	7,933,668.72	6,124,199.61	86.76

This table would mean more, of course, if taken in connection with all other prevailing values. It would seem that one might gain a fairer comparison between the old system and the reorganized plan by considering some differences in the years immediately preceding and following the change under the 1919 Law.

Discussing this comparison of the cost of the new plan with the old, the state board says,

> This tabulation shows that the main increases have been in the items Scholars' Supplies, Fuel, Transportation and Superintendents. Increases in the first two have been unavoidable and have but reflected the soaring prices of all necessities.

SCHOOL COSTS [46]

YEAR	1915-1916	1917-1918	1919-1920
Total expenditures	$2,285,406.37	$3,248,708.09	$3,960,075.67
Teachers	1,269,913.78	1,713,375.01	2,071,670.14
Textbooks	55,551.93	64,118.46	81,002.66
Scholars' supplies	52,378.25	98,532.81	117,608.59
Transportation	90,014.66	144,365.68	195,126.67
Janitors	100,778.23	143,589.24	175,524.71
Fuel, light, water, etc.	128,102.53	236,115.11	248,799.97
High school tuition	88,187.03	129,017.76	116,658.43
Debt and interest	91,440.78	195,867.94	270,604.42
Lands, buildings, alterations	109,553.32	112,071.55	143,108.36
Superintendent's salaries .	70,233.92	114,934.53	186,596.58
Districts under supervision	128	144	256

The increase in superintendent's salaries has been accompanied by an increase in the supervisory field, since twice the districts are now supervised that were in 1916. This fact must be considered in making comparisons.

The increases in the salaries of teachers, the wages of janitors, the expenses for text books and the charges for alterations of buildings have not kept pace with general price increases.

The table on page 142 shows cost of educational effort in New Hampshire in 1917-1918 as compared with that in 1925-1926. Lack of data prevents such comparison on some items.

The items missing for 1917-1918 make 9.5 per cent of the year's expenditures, and the same items for 1925-1926 equal just 10 per cent of the year's total. It may be noted that 1926 costs are relatively higher for Lands, Buildings and Equipment, and for Debt, Interest and Insurance. There has been a relative reduction in cost of Teachers, Textbooks, Supplies and Tuition, Fuel, Water and Janitor Supplies, Janitor Salaries, and for Superintendents' Salaries. Transportation cost relatively the same in the two periods. The total increase in cost of education in 1926 over 1918 is $4,684,960.63, or 144 per cent. The cost per pupil has increased $36.05 since 1918, or about 71 per cent. The cost per high school pupil in 1926 was $149.05 while that of elementary pupils was $73.83. Since the high school enrollment has increased from 11,817 in 1917-1918 to 18,125 in 1926, this relatively higher

---

[46] *New Hampshire State Board of Education Report*, 1919-1920, p. 191.

Cost of Educational Effort in New Hampshire in 1917-1918 as Compared with 1925-1926

	1917-18	Per Cent	1925-26	Per Cent
Total expenditure	$3,248,708.09	100	$7,933,668.72	100
Teachers	1,713,375.01	52	3,488,114.95	44
Lands, buildings, and equipment	134,571.85	4.1	1,185,926.75	14.9
Textbooks, supplies, and tuition	271,669.03	8.3	376,753.06	4.8
Debt, interest, and insurance	214,785.64	6.6	879,541.73	11.1
Fuel, water, and janitor's supplies	236,115.11	7.2	348,252.42	4.4
Transportation	144,365.68	4.4	341,396.61	4.3
Janitors	143,589.24	4.4	283,386.10	3.6
Superintendents	114,934.53	3.5	232,289.04	2.9
Teacher training	No comparable data		183,261.48	
Mothers' aid, medical inspection, etc.	No comparable data		154,915.19	2.3
Local administration ..	No comparable data		116,987.02	1.9
Normal school buildings	No comparable data		289,499.32	1.5
State administration ...	No comparable data		53,345.05	3.6
Cost per pupil	50.71		86.76	.7
		90.5		100

cost per high school pupil increases the average pupil cost for the state in very marked fashion. Had high school attendance increased only in the same proportion as has that of elementary schools, the average cost per pupil for the state would be reduced materially for 1925-1926.

For the school year 1925-1926, the lowest school cost per thousand dollars of equalized valuation in any district in the state was $1.29. The highest cost was $28.68. In the former there was no state aid, of course; in the latter the local district paid only $7.78 local school tax per thousand dollars of equalized valuation while the state aided at the rate of $8.76 per thousand. The highest local district tax in the state was $10.23 per thousand. The smallest payment of state aid was $.08 per thousand to one district, and the highest was $11.94 per thousand dollars valuation in a district which taxed itself $5.24 per thousand.

Discussing the matter of school costs, the 1925-1926 *State Report* says (p. 147),

. . . with our present appropriation the local cost in poor districts is seldom much in excess of $5.00. It was believed that a $5.00 local tax, with our state aid, would pay all the costs of the required elementary schools. It does this but most districts are willing to tax themselves somewhat in order that their schools may be better than the required minimum.

This is the primary reason that the local cost in most of the districts runs a little over $5.00. A $5.00 tax for the required elementary schools is not a heavy burden upon any district. Therefore our state aid has accomplished that for which it was designed.

It is to be understood that the law of 1919 has not reduced, nor was it intended to reduce, the cost of schools in the poor districts. The local cost in most cases has changed little but the schools have improved in that they now have supervision, a full school year, and an improved corps of teachers.

In general, the district tax for elementary schools is not far from $5.00, the tax for general current expenses is about $1.00 but the high school cost varies very greatly. Our conclusion may be this. The law of 1919 has equalized the cost of elementary schools and of supervision. The great difference in the total school cost of districts now depends upon the larger or smaller expenditure for high school maintenance. Our present law without burdensome charges upon the poorer districts has then given them supervision and elementary schools which approximate those of the more progressive towns and cities, and the fine spirit of our state is shown by the fact that the districts which have been taxed to bring about this change have at no time complained or expressed unwillingness to pay their share that all the children in the state should have reasonable school privileges.

This chapter has summarized briefly the record of educational accomplishment in New Hampshire under the plan of organization, administration, and support which was provided by the Law of 1919. At the beginning of its operation, there existed certain educational deficiencies which have been considered in a previous chapter. Having these in mind, the state attempted the construction of certain administrative machinery which was intended to remedy the evils. The law did not in any great measure initiate any theories in education new to New Hampshire except in the field of organization and administration. Even in that regard it was but a culmination of a movement which had been under way for years. That culmination, however, brought to a climax the movement toward centralized control in school affairs, and for the first time there came into existence in the state a central state authority, having large powers of control, and equipped with an expert executive department to which might be given all needed authority to apply such techniques as were necessary to secure desired results. Behind this strong state power was placed, through equalized state aid, the necessary financial power to bring its policies to fruition in every school district of the state. And to this state power was consigned, through the law, an educational program representing the ideals of the people of the state as to what educational conditions should come to prevail.

The system has now been in operation for eight years. It has been changed in some details, but in no highly important regard. This chapter has told briefly what has been accomplished through this system since 1919. It would seem that an unprejudiced consideration of available data warrants the conclusion that the plan has gone far in realization of the program with which it was intrusted. With its inauguration there came rather immediate improvement which has consistently been maintained in the matter of length of school year, pupil attendance, schoolhousing and health conditions, teacher qualification, quality and quantity of professional supervision, secondary school opportunity, and eradication of illiteracy. This improvement, moreover, has been gained with no excessive increase in school costs beyond that which is a result of fundamental economic changes.

This record of attainment gives strong support to the belief that the system of organization, administration, and support, which was provided by the 1919 Law, has inherent in it some basic fitness as an instrument for the solution of such problems as existed in the New Hampshire educational situation of 1919. True, much depends upon the personnel of the administrative force. A strong, dynamic, resourceful administrator will do much to make even a poor plan function well. It is not too much to say that New Hampshire has had such an administrator in the person of State Commissioner of Education Ernest W. Butterfield. An impersonal estimate must class the educational accomplishments which have been realized under his guidance as among the foremost in the United States in the period since 1919. But it is to be noted that Mr. Butterfield served as State Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Hampshire previous to the inauguration of the present system and was not able to accomplish the things which have been realized under the present organization. A strong administrator with insufficient powers cannot produce desired results. The immediate change in quantity and quality of attainment incident to the change of 1919 must be credited in some degree at least to the intrinsic worth of the system itself. It has secured highly desirable results. It has secured them with a reasonable degree of economy. Surely this is the proper outcome of a meritorious system of educational organization, administration, and support.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The development of the educational system of the state of New Hampshire extends through a period of nearly three hundred years. Like the development of all other human institutions, it is an evolution—an unbroken movement in which each unfolding effect becomes a succeeding cause. Each step swings logically from the past and glides certainly into that which succeeds. It is not to be thought, however, that these almost imperceptible successions have moved on a dead level which exhibits no large phases and shows no outstanding characteristics. Viewed in the perspective of almost three centuries of New Hampshire educational development, there may be distinguished four rather distinct periods in administrative theory and practice, each characterized by unmistakable causes and giving rise to no less certain effects. These periods are:

1. 1623-1805. *The Colonial Period,* or the period of the local private and town schools.
2. 1805-1885. *The District Period,* or the period of the subdivided town with local community district schools.
3. 1885-1919. *The Period of Increasing State Influence* and beginning of the supervisory district and state financial aid.
4. 1919- . *The Period of a State School System,* with state-wide organization, centralized administration, professional supervision, and state-wide financial aid.

In the preceding chapters is traced the development of each of these periods. There is needed here but brief summary.

The Colonial Period in New Hampshire was a period of local settlements with consequent large local control of social institutions. Each community was isolated, communication infrequent, travel difficult. The town system of government prevailed except in matters which were obviously of large group concern, with which the state government dealt. Education, for the most part, was left to each small community, the state insisting only that some kind of schools be maintained in some way. All problems of financial support, administrative practice, and pedagogical procedures were left to the towns. The result was possibility of as many standards, policies, practices, and outcomes as there were towns in the state. The interest of any town in education extended no farther than to its own children, and its obligation to support educational endeavor was limited by the same bounds. However, as the towns increased in population, settlements were made in sections so remote from the central town schools that there came demand for the right to establish separate schools in these places. Thus each town came to have a number of schools within its borders and this movement gave rise to the succeeding period in New Hampshire educational organization—the Period of the District.

The District Period offered a solution to the problem of securing schools for the increasing settlements by making it possible for the town to be subdivided for school purposes. Legal provision was made for this type of school organization by the Law of 1805, although the practice of dividing towns into local districts had prevailed for years previous to this date. The district was necessary in its time. In general, each of the rapidly growing settlements had children in such numbers and wealth in such amounts that a local school could well be maintained according to the standards of the time. The control was local, as in the preceding period of the town. However, the opening of the West, the Industrial Revolution, and later the Civil War, started a depopulation movement in the rural sections of New Hampshire and soon many local districts had neither sufficient children nor wealth to maintain a creditable school. At the same time the development of a more complex society, increased ease of travel and communication, and consequent easy movement of people from locality to locality made the education of any single community's children more than a local problem. Development of pedagogical techniques had made rapid educational advancement possible in those places possessing sufficient children and wealth to make purchase and employment of proper educational equipment economically feasible. The depopulated sections, poor and stagnant, lagged behind, and the type of citizenry which they were sending forth into the state created a problem. More and more it became evident that these "deficit communities" could secure for their children the type of education necessary for participation in a modern society only through assistance from without. The small, local district schools, locally supported and locally administered, were failing to produce the necessary results. Efforts to abolish this type of organization, however, met with vigorous opposition from all those who treasured the New England tradition of "local self-government." Interference from without in the school affairs of any local community was looked upon as in violation of some fundamental principles of democracy. And so in the face of rather obvious and increasingly serious shortcomings in the "district system," New Hampshire "localism" held to this type of organization for school government for many years after its necessity and usefulness had passed. Finally, however, in 1885, after years of agitation and temporizing legislation, the district organization was abolished and the town restored as the unit of administration and support.

A Period of Increasing State Influence followed the abolition of the district plan of administrative organization and support in 1885. It should not be thought that this was a distinctly new development. More and more during all the preceding period the people of New Hampshire had come to realize that some desired educational results could be most surely and effectively secured through the operation of a state-wide authority. Administratively, this period from 1885 to 1919 remained very largely that of the town. The power of the state was employed, not in direct administrative practices through a state administrative structure, but in demanding certain prescribed policies and practices to be followed by the local town administrative authorities. During this period, too, came the beginning in New Hampshire of the Supervisory Union. Legislation permitted the union of town districts for the purpose of employing a professional school superintendent. To encourage the practice, the state appropriated funds to assist in paying cost of such supervision. This did not solve the pressing educational problem of the state, for the very towns that most needed assistance were so poor and often so remote as to make membership in a Supervisory Union impossible. In this period, however, there came to be rather state-wide acceptance of the principles of state financial aid and professional school administration and supervision. Overcoming almost three centuries of faith in the tradition that the conducting of schools is a local matter, the friends of education finally convinced the people of New Hampshire that the support and administration of public educational endeavor is a state function. Thus, when the World War revealed some serious shortcomings in the state's educational attainment, it remained only to crystallize a conviction that there should be adopted some type of effective state-wide administrative structure.

This result was achieved by the school law of 1919, which provided for a powerful state board of education composed of educational laymen with a professional educator serving as state commissioner of education and acting as executive officer of the board. With this administrative organization was provision for generous financial aid from the state, making it possible for the poorest towns to have full-year schools, with state accredited teachers, suitable schoolhouses, and professional supervision. A somewhat full account of the educational accomplishments of the state under this plan is to be found in the immediately preceding chapter. In general, it shows that the more centralized plan of control of schools in New Hampshire has secured desirable results which were apparently impossible under the greater degree of local control which had previously prevailed. State-wide standards are enforced and such professional coöperation secured through the work of a strong central agency that New Hampshire may now be said to have a genuine state system of public schools. It would seem, then, that it is not misleading to designate this fourth period in New Hampshire educational organization and administration as the Period of a State School System.

The history of school administration in New Hampshire through these four periods is that of a rather definite trend from local and decentralized control to a greater and greater degree of centralization of power and state control. There has, indeed, never been a time in the whole development when the local units did not acknowledge some degree of state authority in educational matters. The preceding chapters record an ever-growing series of state legislative enactments requiring the performance of certain duties by the local districts in the furtherance of education. Through state mandate, the geographical limits of school districts have been established and modified. The method of raising school money has been prescribed. Its minimum amount has been fixed. District officers and their functions have been defined. School attendance has been made universal and compulsory through state decree. And, finally, that the education of all children of the whole state might be furthered, the state has assumed the financial burden of assisting dependent mothers and providing funds for those sections where economic deficiency makes impossible an effective, exclusively local financial support of public education.

More and more, in all this legislation, and as time has passed, the people of the state as a whole, through their representative assembly have prescribed in general terms what schools should be maintained in every local community, how they should be supported, and who should attend them. In general, it seems to be true that in New Hampshire the state has seen fit to prescribe standards for the local community schools before it saw fit to assume the right to enforce these standards through a state school executive authority. Administration and enforcement of the law was long left to local authorities. The result was such uniformity of standards as varying degrees of local interpretation and enforcement of the state law might secure. The history of New Hampshire education seems to show that the tradition of "local self-government" clings to the *forms* of administrative machinery after it has ceased to maintain a desire for the actual *results* of such local control. "Localism" seemingly secures more satisfactions from its manipulation of the machinery of government than from contemplation of the outcomes of governmental action. Thus the creation of effective administrative structures has almost always lagged behind the advancement of educational ideals.

Distinguished though each of these periods is by its own particular characteristics, yet there are certain general features which belong to all. In each of the four periods, it may be said of the institution of public education, as of all the others of mankind's institutions, that it has not developed in isolation. Always it has been but a thread which patterned itself through the complex texture of a society's evolution. Its philosophy, its fiscal policies, its type of organization, its standards, and its administrative structures and techniques have at each stage but reflected the social, economic, and political beliefs and practices which grew from the necessities of the times and prevailed in all the other activities of the people's life. As one considers the whole development of New Hampshire's educational system through its various phases and in light of the conditions, beliefs, and practices which characterized the time and society of each respective phase, he is impressed with the fact that it has been an almost futile effort to attempt to bring large changes in administrative organization and practice in education when somewhat comparable changes were not made in society's policies and methods of organizing and administering its other institutions and activities. There are, of course, some cases where this is not true, but the general principle seems to be acceptable. This does not mean the acceptance of a fatalistic conception—a belief that it is useless to strive to bring needed changes in the policies and practices of any particular institution. It means, rather, that those who labor to improve administrative practice in one field need not take unto themselves great blame when their efforts fail to raise their institution's accomplishments much beyond that of the other activities of their society. The inertia, as well as the momentum, of a whole society is not easily moved or resisted. In a period when a wide acceptance of the general theory of decentralized control in social activities prevails, it is almost hopeless to expect that there will be belief in the correctness of centralization of control of the institutions of education. If, however, there has come out of the distant past, through social inheritance, some institution with highly centralized control, it may be accepted traditionally, thus giving rise to those few cases where a people live with some activity of their lives directed by some distant and centralized power, while all other social interests are locally directed. But these exceptions do not invalidate the rather general principle, and it may be said that the history of New Hampshire education shows that the policies and practices which prevail in the general social activities are reflected rather truly in the educational theories and procedures.

When one considers the efficacy and value of the types of school organization and administration which have prevailed at different times in New Hampshire, he is led to believe that there is no one system which is absolutely good; but that their values are always relative. The type which is good at one period would be impracticable and undesirable under other conditions. The system of control which is most efficient in 1926 would have been impossible in the New Hampshire of 1726 or 1826. It would seem unwise for any friend of education to become a fanatical supporter of any one plan of school support and administration. The chief evil of such fanaticism is a delayed change from an antiquated system to a new type which fits changed social conditions, but overeager friends of educational advancement might easily commit the blunder of attempting the use of an advanced and complex plan of organization in a society where simplicity of social structure and retarded economic development made such a policy ruinous. The history of New Hampshire education seems to show no case of the latter mistake, although it exhibits many cases of overreluctant abandonment of some outworn system of school control. The rapidity of nineteenth century social and industrial evolution, amounting almost to a revolution, left behind most of society's social structures and the school was no exception. The invention of new methods of social control did not keep pace with the production of new and pressing problems which arose from improved economic and industrial policies and techniques. It is not altogether misleading to say that New Hampshire has developed new and better educational ideals before it has been able to discover and accept proper administrative machinery to make these ideals productive.

A study of New Hampshire's educational development must add to one's conviction that educational theory, philosophy, principles, ideals, and aspirations are helpless in the absence of a system of organization and financial support and administrative policies and techniques which will make these principles effective in practice. It cannot be too often pointed out that educational administrative methods, techniques, and practices are always a means only, and that the realization of educational ideals and values are the end. But it should never be forgotten that all searching for ultimate social values to be realized in education is entirely fruitless unless an unceasing effort goes hand in hand with it to develop effective administrative policies, structures, and techniques. There is properly no dualism in an educational system—a dualism of philosophy and administration. Each is as necessary to the other as are the mill and the grain, if there is to be the grinding of a grist. One may look far for statement of higher educational aspirations and finer educational ideals than may be found in the old New Hampshire town reports, but many of these flowered amid the hills and woods of the Granite State to wither unfruited because the potent pollen of an adequate administrative policy and practice was lacking.

One cannot give thoughtful consideration to so representative an educational development as that of the state of New Hampshire without feeling at its conclusion the press of some insistent and unanswered questions which are, perhaps, more provocative of thought than are any of the concluding solutions. At the end of this brief study there seems to remain a large interrogation point. It is the question of just what constitutes the proper degree and limits of centralized and decentralized control and support of a public educational system. With this question there comes a host of related ones, and altogether they present a genuine and practical problem for the student and practitioner of professional education.

The development of New Hampshire's system of education exhibits some results which would seem to arise naturally from varying degrees of centralized and decentralized control of public schools. With decentralized control there has been, of course, support of the schools from local funds, alone, and the application of almost purely local knowledges, skills, procedures, policies, and techniques in conducting and administering educational institutions. The dangers and evils of such a plan are not far to seek. The schools are at the mercy of possible local ignorance, prejudice, avarice, and poverty. There will be only such expert service and professional skill as fortuity makes possible. Not only will educational laymen dictate school policies, but they will design and prescribe all techniques and methods. Of these they have only such knowledges as are the possession of the average layman in any field. Each school is administratively isolated from all others except as chance gives contact, and so profits but little from the world's accumulation of scientifically determined pedagogical techniques. There is unending, unnecessary, and largely fruitless local experimentation with no well-established norms as criteria. Under such a plan, though likeness of ideal and procedure be desired among them, the lack of sufficient financial support in some local districts makes equal educational attainment impossible, and uniformity in the schools of a state and in their product is practically impossible of realization. No widespread injury is done to the society, of course, if the educational product of the deficient community remains there and owes only local duties, but if social and economic conditions are such that there is interchange of people between communities and the sharing of widespread social obligations, then the deficiencies in the citizens of one locality become a proper object of the concern of other places. The policies and procedures in conducting the schools of the local community then become the legitimate business of all affected parties, and obligation to assist in maintaining such schools as will properly meet the wider need rests upon that wider community.

Greater degree of centralized control is the result. It proceeds on the theory that the wider group possesses knowledges and financial means necessary to proper educational attainment, and which the smaller community cannot contribute. This opens the way to introduction of expert service, since a wide community must needs act through greater degree of delegated power. Since one control is exerted over many schools, there is possibility of uniformity in standards and procedures. The affluence of one part of the wider community assists to provide for the needs in the less wealthy sections. The schools are no longer the small localities' schools. All have become a matter of concern for the wider community.

As noted before, New Hampshire has passed through this centralizing experience. Results in educational attainment show that it has been a desirable tendency. But as one contemplates the movement and its results, he is led to ask: How far may it safely go? If some centralization of control in education has secured good results, why will not more centralization secure more improvement? Where is the point at which the movement becomes undesirable? What is the unit of control which should determine school policy and practice for a local community? How far is it proper to go with the policy of requiring wealthy sections to assist in purchasing educational service for less fortunate places? What are the criteria by which one can determine when the educational attainment of one people becomes the legitimate concern of another population?

The state of New Hampshire has accepted the principle that it is properly the concern of its wealthy community of Manchester just what type of education the economically less fortunate localities of Unity or Acworth give to their children. It has declared, moreover, the obligation of the fortunate places to assist in providing educational institutions and activities in these "deficit" sections of the state such that there shall be possibility of uniform educational qualifications in all citizens of the commonwealth. The principle and practice are defended on the ground that the deficiency of one section of the state affects the welfare of the people of another section. If this principle be true of a state, why is it not true of a nation? What magic in social process makes influence of an illiterate and backward region stop completely at an imaginary line between states of the nation while it sweeps unchecked across the boundaries of counties and towns within a state? How can it be maintained that it is the privilege and obligation of separated towns or counties of a state to insist and assist that there be maintained effective and uniformly standard schools in all parts of that state, when there is admitted no duty or right of the nation to demand proper educational standards in any of its states which may lag behind the necessary standards of that nation? How does a state's right to maintain poor schools, if it wishes, become legitimate in a nation when a town's right to do likewise is properly outlawed in a state? How can one justify a strong state department of education, bringing necessary administrative, financial, and pedagogical assistance to the unprogressive and educationally incapable parts of a state, and at the same time find no possible justification for a strong national department of education doing a like service for the retarded portions of the nation? If it be unjust for a nation to overwhelm the desires and standards of the people of a state in order to bring their educational standards up to the level of the whole nation through imported financial and administrative aid, what logic can make it justice for the whole people of a state to ignore the local desires of a town and force higher standards upon it through imported funds and experts? Can it be proper to tax the people of a whole state to assist in maintaining desirable schools in economically unproductive portions of that state, and yet be improper to tax the people of the whole nation to assist some less productive state in raising educational standards to the average level of that nation? If it be detrimental to permit the ignorance, prejudice, and avarice of a community in a state to determine educational policies, procedures and accomplishments for that community, why is it not a detriment to permit the ignorance, prejudice, and avarice of any state to curtail the educational attainment of its people?

The purpose of this study does not permit discussion of all of these and many other related problems, nor do the data which have been used justify definite answer to the questions which one asks. It seems proper, however, to say that one can not contemplate the three centuries of development in New Hampshire without feeling that he is beholding the never-ceasing evolution of a wider and wider society—a complex, interdependent, far flung community in which the obligations and privileges of moral and civic citizenship are shared by an extended and ever-increasing group. Beneath the relentless sweep of this evolution he sees old boundaries crack, break, and crumble as insistent and inevitable social and economic changes surge in upon the crest of an ever-mounting wave of scientific discovery. What was a day's forced march for the legions of an emperor becomes the morning motor ride of little children to their schoolhouse. Those who were strangers in a far country have become co-laborers in a common vineyard where the adversity of one surely becomes the wretchedness of all. As this ever-increasing group meets the issues of its existence together, it arms itself with a multiplying mass of techniques and divides its labors through unending specializations. Confronted, then, with the need of an unfailing foundation of common knowledge, this ever-widening group insists upon a universal educational accomplishment and places the task of its realization in the hands of those who have specialized in the techniques which experience has shown secure the desired conditions. The result is increased centralization of power to control the educational endeavors of the widespread community and the employment of educational experts to labor for the group.

One who traces this movement through the three hundred years of New Hampshire education can hardly feel that the process has suddenly reached a stopping place in our day. He feels, instead, that he is viewing a thing set in motion by unfailing economic, social, and technical forces which, far from having exhausted their potency, are apparently but well started in their influence. Who would prophesy the administrative unit in education three hundred years hence might well ponder the amazement of New Hampshire's earliest colonists could they view the forces which now dictate school policies and practices in their one-time sovereign towns. For the grinding wheels of social evolution that crushed down New Hampshire's old stone walls along the boundaries of her ancient towns can no less surely blot out the lines which mark the dominions of a nation's states. And he who trembles in fear of the terrors of a nation's educational bureaucracy may find his best arguments in the minutes of New Hampshire's old town meetings where "localism" prophesied the decay of the fundamentals of democracy should the state ever take from the sovereign towns their ancient right to support and administer the public schools for the education of their children.

Eighty years have passed since Richard Rust, as Commissioner of Common Schools, wrote his report for 1850 to the General Court of the State of New Hampshire. Tremendous issues have been met and solved by the human race in that time. No eighty years in the history of humanity's endeavors has produced more momentous changes. In kaleidoscopic succession yesterday's chimera has become to-day's practicality, and to-morrow's fondest tradition. And yet one might seek far to find a more appropriate concluding estimate of the entire three centuries of New Hampshire's educational endeavors and achievements than this one-time laborer in the schools of the rock-ribbed Granite State gave of his labors of the year. Of its three hundred years of educational effort New Hampshire may well say:

> Flattering indications of success have crowned our incipient measures of school reform, and motives hang in clusters to cheer us onward in our work. As the richest soils yield no harvest without assiduous care and protracted labor, and as those fruits which are most enduring and valuable mature the slowest and require the greatest attention, so, it is ever to be reiterated, the price of a good school is constant effort, and untiring patience is essential in maturing any effective system of universal instruction; for harvests of such varied wealth are not precocious nor of spontaneous growth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abstract of the *Fourteenth Census* of the United States, 1920.

Barnard's Journal of Education, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 353-368. "Schools as they were in New Hampshire," by J. W. Simonds.

Collections of the New Hampshire Historical Society, beginning in 1824.

Comparison of the Educational Systems of New Hampshire, Alabama and California. A. C. Cotton. 1910.

Comparison of the Educational System of New Hampshire with two Systems of the Central States. John D. Clark, 1906.

The Government of New Hampshire. L. S. Morrison. The W. B. Ranney Company, Concord, 1922.

History of Education in New Hampshire. George Gary Bush. United States Bureau of Education, 1898.

"History of Education in New Hampshire." Rev. Nathaniel Bouton, D.D. *New Hampshire Historical Society Proceedings,* 1833. (See p. 36 *et seq.*)

History of New Hampshire. Jeremy Belknap. Three volumes, 1784-1792. (See Vol. II, p. 349; Vol. III, p. 288 *et seq.*)

History of New Hampshire. John N. McClintock. Boston, 1888. (See pp. 368, 508 *et seq;* 653, 654, 664-666.)

History of New Hampshire from Its First Discovery to the Year 1830, with Dissertations, etc., to the Year 1874. Edwin D. Sanborn, LL.D., 1875. (See pp. 152, 364, 352.)

The History of New Hampshire from Its Discovery in 1614 to the Passage of the Toleration Act in 1819. George Barstow. (See pp. 285-288 and 393 *et seq.*)

History of New Hampshire Schools and School Legislation. Ernest W. Butterfield. Granite Monthly P. G. 57, 1925, pp. 19 to 37.

A History of Taxation in New Hampshire. Maurice H. Robinson. Published for American Economic Association by The Macmillan Company, New York, 1902.

The Laws of New Hampshire, 1679 to 1926.

New Hampshire Provincial Papers, 1663-1776.

New Hampshire State Papers, 1776- .

New Hampshire State School Reports. (Historical accounts of Education in New Hampshire): 1872, pp. 135 to 169; 1875, pp. 295 to 301; 1876, pp. 137 to 305; 1877, pp. 198 to 216; 1923-1924, pp. 40 to 67.

New Hampshire Town Papers.

New Hampshire as It Is. Edwin A. Charlton, 1855. (See Part III, pp. 479-491.)

The Public Schools of New Hampshire and Ohio. Address by S. T. Worcester. Printed in Nashua in 1871.

Reports of the State School Commissioner, Secretary of the State Board of Education, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and State Commissioner of Education, 1848-1926.

Sketches of the History of New Hampshire, from its Settlement in 1623 to 1833. John M. Whiton. Concord, 1834.

See "Education" and "Schools" in index of New Hampshire Town Histories.

LA328 .B62
The development of the state school
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00026 0796